

The
Edinburgh Review
VOL- 94. Part- 1
1851

Sas.
Librarian

Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library
Govt. of West Bengal

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

JULY, 1851.

—
No. CXCI.
—



ART. I.—1. *Novum Testamentum Græcè et Latine*. CAROLUS LACHMANNUS recensuit, PHILIPPUS BUTTMANNUS, Ph. F. Græcæ Lectionis auctoritates apposuit. Tomus prior. Berolini: 1842.

2. *Novum Testamentum Græcè*. Ad antiquos testes recensuit apparatus criticum multis modis auctum et correctum apposuit, commentationem isagogicam præmisit CONSTANTINUS TISCHENDORF, Theol. Dr. et Prof. Lipsiæ: 1840.

3. *The Greek Testament; with a critically revised Text, a Digest of various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usages; Prolegomena; and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. For the Use of Theological Students and Ministers. By HENRY ALFORD, M.A., Vicar of Wymeswold, Leicestershire, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In Two Volumes. Vol. I. containing the Gospels. London: Livingtons, 1849. (Pp. 88. and 664.)

OF the works at the head of this article, the first is but little known in this country, although, as our readers will see by the date of its publication, it has already been several years in circulation. The second is from the hand of a scholar who, about ten years back, published a text of the New Testament, which, from its cheapness, portability, and typographical distinctness, acquired some degree of popularity in university lecture rooms, although it neither claimed nor possessed any merit as a critical effort. The present edition, which may be regarded as entirely recast, has lost the neat and attractive

aspect of its predecessor. It is printed in the sharp upright type to which the publications of Didot, at Paris, have familiarised, but not reconciled, the eyes of men; the character is small; and the abbreviations in the notes are carried to such a pitch, that even after an acquaintance of considerable standing with the book, its perusal remains a very painful task. The third publication, that of Mr. Alford, may fairly be expected to acquire a greater degree of popularity than either of the others; but we somewhat question whether it will have full justice done it by the unprofessional public. It exhibits considerable diligence and reading, — a sincere and earnest religious faith, — and above all, a courageous love of truth which is deserving of the highest approbation. But, on the other hand, it is too extensive in its design to permit of an uniformly satisfactory execution. It is the first attempt, we believe, in this country, to discuss in a single volume all (or almost all) the important problems which philological investigations bring to light respecting the authenticity, the genuineness, the authority, and the specific character of the writings of the New Testament; and as these momentous topics are discussed in the vernacular language, it is obvious that they will be brought before the attention of multitudes who are little, if at all, qualified to consider them, and who will perhaps, in some instances, remain unsatisfied with the explanation of difficulties of which they had previously never dreamed. We freely confess, that with every disposition to give Mr. Alford credit for those qualities which a scholar and a divine ought to possess, we almost regret that practical discretion did not sufficiently operate with him to induce him to clothe his remarks in a Latin garb. Every one competent to enter into his arguments would be also competent to do it, if they had been presented in that dress which transfers debate from the pages of the weekly newspaper to the matured treatise of the sober theologian. It is no doubt a vital principle of Protestantism that the title deeds of religion should never be closed from investigation; that we should always be prepared, if necessary, to show the connexion between the primitive church and our own, and to demonstrate that we are not following ‘cunningly devised fables,’ but maintaining a belief identical with that of the first preachers of the Gospel. And we are very far from sharing the suspicion and dislike with which the searching processes of criticism are regarded by some modern religious schools, who seem entirely to forget that the language they use can only be consistently employed by such as consider the Reformation an act of schism. All that we stipulate for in philological investigations bearing upon the

sacred writings (supposing them conducted in an earnest spirit), is that they shall be addressed to genuine scholars, not prematurely popularised to suit the taste of the crowd of sciolists.

It is obvious that of the various topics which are touched upon by Mr. Alford in his volume, the most important — because that upon which all the others depend — must be the one which stands first in his title-page; that is, the critical revision of the Text. It is manifestly premature to enter upon a minute analysis of style until we have first accurately ascertained the structural condition of the writings in question in their primitive form. Still less can we, until this is done, argue with any degree of certainty, *from internal evidence*, as to the country of the author, the date of the composition, and the special object he had in view. Let us suppose, by way of illustration, that we knew nothing of Wiclif or his labours, except what might be gathered from the existence of manuscripts of his translation of the Bible. It is well known that the orthography of these varies considerably, according to the part of England in which the copy happened to be made, the transcribers of that period (as the Greeks always) often writing as they spoke. The first inference, therefore, of a person who fell in with a Northumbrian copy of the work would be to presume the author a native of the north. But from the very same principles another, into whose hands a copy written in the west of England might fall, would assign him to that locality, on equally plausible and equally insufficient grounds. Again, let us take the opening sentence of Milton's 'Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes,' and observe how a slight transposition of words affects the whole colour of the style. He writes, 'I have prepared, Supreme Council, against the much-expected time of your sitting, this treatise; which though to all Christian magistrates equally belonging, and therefore to have been written in the common language of Christendom, natural duty and affection hath confined and dedicated first to my own nation.' Every English scholar will instantly perceive, from the arrangement of the clauses of this sentence, that the work from which it is taken belongs to the seventeenth century.* But if we make a slight change in the arrangement, by reading, 'I have prepared this treatise against the much-expected time of your sitting; which, though equally belonging to all Christian magistrates, &c., we transform it at once into the style of the latter half of the eighteenth. Now, variations analogous to the above, as well as others of a more considerable character, abound in

* It was first printed in 1659.

the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, so that even the unlearned reader, accustomed only to the common English version, will at once see that discrimination between the several authorities is a matter of extreme delicacy, but not more delicate than necessary previous to any minute criticism of the writings.

But his opinion of the difficulty of the task will not be diminished when he learns the multitude of the phenomena which the verbal critic has to take into account. The Greek text of the New Testament was first printed from a single manuscript, with occasional references to two others, by the celebrated Erasmus*; and down to the year 1707, the additional authorities of which a succession of editors had availed themselves, were limited to seventeen. For nearly a century the Elzevir edition of 1624 was regarded as the *ne plus ultra* of a correct text. That edition, of which the editor is to this day unknown, enjoyed and still among all but professed scholars enjoys a reputation, to which the whole history of literature can scarcely produce a parallel either for its magnitude or its baselessness. The well deserved credit of the Elzevir press no doubt contributed something to this at the outset, but probably the real reason which produced it is to be found in the fact that the edition of 1624 was, however critically worthless, a compromise between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants, to which the disputants on each side were willing to appeal. The one regarded the Complutensian edition, published at Alcalá, in Spain, under the auspices of Cardinal Ximenes, as the standard printed text†; the other held by the text of Robert Estienne (Stephens). But in the third edition‡ of Stephens a considerable step had been made towards ~~a compromise~~ of critical exactness in favour of theological ~~accuracy~~; and it is by an arbitrary union of this text with that of Beza, that what has since gone by the name of the 'Received Text' was produced. The reprint in the year 1633 announces itself in the preface of the anonymous editor by the words, 'Textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum,'—an expression which, although originally intended to describe the edition as one to

* In the year 1516. The revision was conducted on no general principle; but Mr. Alford has no right, that we are aware of, to call it 'tampering' with the MSS.

† Printed in the year 1514, but not published till 1522.

‡ Printed in the year 1550. It is based upon the 5th edition of Erasmus (1535); but in the Apocalypse follows the Complutensian. In its turn it formed the basis of the editions, ten in number, published by Beza between the years 1565 and 1618:

which theologians of all parties were contented to appeal*, insensibly came to be accepted as a testimony to the critical value of the text.

But, in the year 1707, a complete revolution was produced by the publication of the edition of the learned Dr. Mill. The famous Alexandrine manuscript — by very far the most ancient at that time known — had been partially brought within the cognizance of the learned world by the Polyglott of the celebrated Brian Walton. This inestimable treasure of antiquity, which contains (with some *lacunæ*) the whole of the Greek text both of the Old and New Testaments, was a present of Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, to King Charles the First. It is supposed to have been written not later than the end of the fifth century; a date six or seven hundred years earlier than any of the authorities upon which the text of the Elzevir edition rested. Another volume of even a more remarkable character, containing the four Gospels and the Book of Acts, had also excited much attention. This was the singular Codex Bezae, so called from the donor, Beza, who gave it to the University of Cambridge, in the year 1581. He describes it in his letter as of venerable antiquity, and as having been discovered in the Monastery of St. Irenæus at Lyons, about twenty years before. The age of this book is a matter of much dispute; some considering its antiquity to rival, or even exceed, that of the Alexandrine; others bringing it down as low as the eighth century. Tischendorf, the last editor of the New Testament who professes to have carefully examined it, assigns it to the middle of the sixth; in our opinion a century at least too early. Both these manuscripts, especially the latter, were found to present very great variations from the 'Textus ab omnibus receptus.' A

* The convenience of controversialists gave rise to another arrangement, extremely prejudicial to the sound understanding of the sacred volume, namely, the division into verses. The elder Stephens first of all introduced this into his fourth edition (1551). He made it 'inter equitandum' on a journey from Paris to Lyons, and placed the numbers only in the margin. But in the English version, printed at Geneva in 1557, the actual text was broken up into the fragmentary shape now commonly in use.

† We must remind the lay reader, that we use the terms 'great' and 'small,' with reference to the question of the accurate constitution of the sacred text, not to the importance of the doctrine which may be elicited from this or that reading. In point of fact, the doctrines of the English Church would not be affected even if the worst readings of the worst MSS. were in every case to be purposely adopted.

similar result exhibited itself in the oldest manuscripts containing the Latin versions from the Greek. They are of such a description, so faithful—we may almost say servile—in their adherence to the letter of the original, that, in very many cases, it may be discovered, with absolute certainty, what reading existed in the copy which the translator used. To the surprise of every one, it was found that the more ancient the manuscripts containing these translations, the more closely did they agree with the text of the Alexandrine codex in those places in which it varied from the Elzevir standard. Nor was this all. In the early ages of the Church, translations of the sacred writings had been made not only into Latin,—the language in which they would be accessible to the Christians of Italy, Gaul, Spain, and Northern Africa,—but also into Coptic and its branches for the benefit of the Egyptian, and Syrian for that of the Oriental converts.* These translations, for the most part, supported the ancient authorities. The same was the case with the early Greek Fathers. The quotations of Clement of Alexandria and of Origen were found to tell on the same side with the early Greek and Latin manuscripts, and with the ancient versions into Syrian and Coptic. Struck by all these concurring circumstances, Mill conceived that a passage in St. Augustine offered a clue to the recovery not only of the primitive Greek Text, but of the earliest Latin Version, established, as he imagined probable, by public authority within the very first century. Augustine†, after speaking of the benefit which may be derived by a student of the Scriptures from consulting various translations, adds the words ‘*In ipsis autem interpretationibus Italica cæteris præferatur: nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ.*’ This expression Mill regarded as establishing the existence of a definite version into Latin, known in the time of Augustine by the name of the ‘Italian Version,’ and characterised by its extreme adherence to the letter of the original, which was limited only by a due regard for perspicuity. He supposed that it was the Version publicly used in the Roman Church previously to the time of Jerome, by whose new translation, which is the basis of the modern

* The Syrian version was made in the second, the Coptic in the third century. These, and the Gothic version of Ulphilas, made in the fourth, appear to be the only versions made in early times direct from the Greek, and, consequently, the only genuine representatives of Greek codices. To cite versions which are either translations from the Vulgate, or from Greek manuscripts altered to agree with the Vulgate, is simple loss of time and paper to the verbal critic.

† *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*, ii. cap. 15.

Vulgate, it had been gradually superseded, — but that it still existed in those ancient Latin manuscripts which might be found to contain a translation different from the Vulgate of Jerome, and at the same time possessing characteristics answering to the description of Augustine. These might be further recognised by their agreement with the citations of Scripture found in the writings of the Latin Fathers antecedent to the time of Jerome, — Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilary of Poitiers, and the Latin Irenæus. Supposing a number of codices collected answering to these tests, the text constituted by their comparison would be the ‘*Vetus Itala*’ version; and the combination of this critical Latin text with the oldest Greek MSS. (checked in their turn by the quotations of Clement and Origen) would allow of the constitution, on rigidly critical principles, of a text differing, by a scarcely appreciable amount, from that which was recognised in the age of those who had themselves conversed with the Apostles.

To the execution of the idea of Dr. Mill, however, there existed some insuperable obstacles. In the first place, the Alexandrine codex, although of immensely superior antiquity to the manuscripts on which the ‘*Received Text*’ rested, stood alone in its opposition to them in many instances, Beza’s codex (besides that it contains nothing but the four Gospels and the Acts) occasionally differing quite as much from the Alexandrine readings, which were supported by Clement and Origen, as it did from the Elzevir standard. In some places, too, the Alexandrine has suffered from the ravages of time; so that in these there appeared to be no means of completing the text consistently with the principles laid down. Moreover, there was felt to be an obvious inconvenience in making the Greek text as it were subordinate to that of the Latin versions. Almost immediately after the passage above quoted from Augustine, which inspired Mill with the hopes of recovering the ‘*Vetus Itala*,’ there follows another which seemed decisively to discourage his proceeding with his design under existing circumstances.* He gave up, therefore, the prosecution of the object which he had pointed out, and contented himself with reprinting the ‘*Received Text*,’ and exhibiting in the margin the variations from it which the older manuscripts, versions, and Fathers furnished.

This proceeding was not one calculated to break the shock which the publication of his book occasioned to all but the

* *Libros autem Novi Testamenti, si quid in Latinis varietatibus titubat, Græcis celerè oportere non dubium est, et maxime qui apud ecclesias doctiores et diligentiores reperiantur.*

learned. By a mental process not unlike the one which generated the doctrine of Transubstantiation, that influence of the Holy Spirit * which had pervaded the first teachers of our religion, and which still breathes in their written remains, had come to be popularly regarded as of a kind to furnish security to those remains against corruption by the hands of transcribers during their transmission through successive ages. Accordingly, when an edition appeared, exhibiting in the margin more than 30,000 variations from the standard text, great excitement was produced. The Roman Catholics rejoiced at what they considered a confirmation of their strongest position, — the alleged necessity of an oral tradition, supernaturally transmitted through the hands of the Church, to explain and interpret the doubtful passages of Holy Scripture. Enemies of revealed religion, under any shape whatever, were delighted at the discovery of what they represented as a thorough corruption of the authentic documents of Christianity. In our days, when the experience of a century has shown the real utility of these — then unwelcome — phenomena, and when the collation of additional manuscripts has augmented their number to more than 200,000, it is difficult to conceive the consternation and perplexity which was occasioned when their existence first became known to the public, or to measure the evil which might have resulted had there not been living at that time, in the possession of a station and a reputation which enabled him to stem the tide of timid superstition, the greatest scholar that England has ever produced — Richard Bentley, master of Trinity College, Cambridge. In a short letter, published under the name of *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, he showed the value, in the hands of those who understood the matter, of such collations as Mill's margin exhibited; and that, instead of weakening the authority of the sacred text, they, in fact, furnished the means of ascertaining it in its most genuine form. He himself had entertained a design somewhat similar to that of Mill, but based upon a much surer foundation. This (in a letter to Archbishop Wake, dated April 15. 1716,) he explains so lucidly, that it is impossible to abridge the communication without omitting some material point, and we therefore give it *in extenso* : —

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE, — 'Tis not only your Grace's station and general character, but the particular know-

* The profound remark of Coleridge relative to the Sacrament of the Eucharist is applicable to the true idea of Inspiration. It is a thing *sui generis*, which one extreme party *evaporates into a metaphor*, and the other *condenses into an idol*.

ledge I have of you, which encourages me to give you a long letter about those unfashionable topics, Religion and Learning. Your Grace knows, as well as any, what an alarm has been made of late years with the vast heap of Various Lections found in MSS. of the Greek Testament. The Papists have made a great use of them against the Protestants, and the Atheists against them both. This was one of Collins's topics in his Discourse on Freethinking, which I took off in my short answer; and I have heard since, from several hands, that that short view I gave of the causes, and necessity, and use of Various Lections, made several good men more easy in that matter than they were before. But since that time I have fallen into a course of studies that led me to peruse many of the oldest MSS. of the Greek Testament and of the Latin, too, of St. Jerome, of which there are several in England a full thousand years old; the result of which has been that I find I am able (what some thought impossible) to give an edition of the Greek Testament exactly as it was in the best exemplars at the time of the Council of Nice; so that there shall not be twenty words, nor even particles, difference; and this shall carry its own demonstration in every verse, which I affirm cannot be so done of any other ancient book, Greek or Latin; so that that book, which, by the present management, is thought the most uncertain, shall have a testimony of certainty above all other books whatever, and an end be put at once to all Various Lections now or hereafter.

I'll give your Grace the progress which brought me, by degrees, into the present view and scheme that I have of a new edition. Upon some points of curiosity, I collated one or two of St. Paul's Epistles, with the Alexandrian MS., the oldest and best now in the world.* I was surprised to find several transpositions of words, that Mill and the other collators took no notice of: but I soon found their way was to mark nothing but change of words; the collocation and order they entirely neglected; and yet, at first sight, I discerned what a new force and beauty this new order (I found in the MS.) added to the sentence. This encouraged me to collate the whole book over to a letter, with my own hands. There is another MS. at Paris†, of the same age and character with this; but meeting

* The Vatican Codex had not at this time been examined.

† This is the Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (Reg. Par. No. 9.). Its real character was detected by Alrix, a French Protestant minister, who took refuge in England on the revocation of the Edict of Nantz. Burnet made him a prebendary of Salisbury, and the University of

‘ with worse usage, it was so decayed by age, that five hundred years ago it served the Greeks for old vellum; and they writ over the old brown capitals a book of Ephraim Syrus; but so that even now, by a good eye and a skilful person, the old writing may be read under the new. . . . Out of this, by an able hand, I have had above two hundred lections given me from the present printed Greek; and I was surprised to find that almost all agreed both in word and order with our noble Alexandrian. Some more experiments in other old copies have discovered the same agreement: so that I dare say, take all the Greek Testaments surviving, that are not *occidental* with *Latin too*, like our Beza’s at Cambridge, and that are a thousand years old,—and they’ll so agree together, that of the thirty thousand present Various Lections, there are not there found two hundred.*

‘ The western Latin copies, by variety of translators, without public appointment, and a jumble and heap of all of them, were grown so uncertain, that scarce two copies were alike; which obliged Damasus, then Bishop of Rome, to employ St. Jerome to regulate the best received translation of each part of the New Testament to the original Greek; and so set out a new edition, so castigated and corrected. This he declares in his preface he did *ad Græcum veritatem, ad exemplaria Græca, sed vetera*; and his learning, great name, and just authority, extinguished all the other Latin versions; and [his] has been conveyed down to us under the name of the Vulgate. ’Twas plain to me, that when that copy came first from that great Father’s hands, it must agree exactly with the most authentic Greek exemplars; and if it could now be retrieved, it would be the best test and voucher for the true reading out of several pretending ones. But when I came to try Pope Clement’s Vulgate, I soon found the Greek of the Alexandrian and that would by no means pary. This set me to examine the

Oxford conferred an honorary degree upon him. He was a man of great erudition, and the author of many works, principally controversial, now little read.

* Nothing can exhibit the critical sagacity of Bentley more strikingly than his exact estimate of the value of the Alexandrine Codex, which had been much over-estimated by Mill. It is quite clear that the transcriber of it has been in many places influenced by a regard for the Hieronymic version, as is distinctly shown by Wetstein, though only a small percentage of the passages he cites tells for his argument. Although invaluable, therefore, for ascertaining the Greek text *which Jerome used*, it is not to be cited for that of a more ancient date in the first instance.

‘ Pope’s Latin by some MSS. of a thousand years old; and the success is, that the old Greek copies and the old Latin so exactly agree (when an able hand discerns the rasures and the old lections lying under them), that the pleasure and satisfaction it gives me is beyond expression.

‘ The New Testament has been under a hard fate since the invention of printing. After the Complutenses and Erasmus, who had but very ordinary MSS., it has become the property of booksellers. Robert Stephens’s edition, set out and regulated by himself alone, is now become the standard. That text stands as if an apostle was his compositor. No heathen author has had such ill-fortune. Terence, Ovid, &c., for the first century after printing, went about with twenty thousand errors in them. But when learned men undertook them, and, from the oldest MSS., set out correct editions, those errors fell and vanished. But if they had kept to the first published text, and set the Various Lections only in the margin, those classic authors would be as clogged with variations as Dr. Mill’s Testament is.

‘ Popes Sixtus and Clemens*, at a vast expense, had an assembly of learned divines, to recense and adjust the Latin Vulgate, and then enacted their new edition authentic; but I find, though I have not yet discovered anything done *dolo malo*, they were quite unequal to the affair. They were mere Theologi, had no experience in MSS., nor made use of good Greek copies; and followed books of five hundred years before those of double [that] age. Nay, I believe they took these new ones for the older of the two; for it is not every body knows the age of a manuscript.

‘ I am already tedious, and the post is a going; so that, to conclude, in a word, I find that, by taking two thousand errors out of the Pope’s Vulgate, and as many out of the Protestant Pope Stephens’s, I can set out an edition of each in columns, without using any book under nine hundred years old, that shall so exactly agree, word for word; and, what at first

* The Romish Church has furnished the Reformers with a constant weapon of annoyance, by successively pronouncing the text of each of these editions authentic, although they differ from one another in several hundred places. The Protestant polemics took advantage of this breach in the theory of Infallibility. A book was published at Oxford in 1600, entitled *BELLUM PAPALE, sive Concordia Discors Sixti V. et Clementis VIII.*, which so galled the champions of the Papacy, that an attempt was made to deny the publication of the Sixtine edition. Unfortunately, however, some copies exist, — one in the Bodleian.

'amazed me, order for order*, that no two tallics, nor two indentures, can agree better.

'I affirm that these so placed will prove each other to a demonstration; for I alter not a letter of my own head without the authority of these old witnesses. And the beauty of the composition (barbarous, God knows, at present) is so improved, as makes it more worthy of a revelation, and yet not one text of consequence injured or weakened.

'My Lord, if a casual fire should take either his Majesty's library or the King of France's, all the world could not do this. As I have, therefore, great impulse, and I hope not *ἀδελφί*, to set about this work immediately and leave it as a *κεν-μηλιον* to posterity, against Atheists and infidels, I thought it my duty and my honour to first acquaint your Grace with it; and know if the extrinsic expense necessary to do such a work completely (for my labour I reckon nothing) may obtain any encouragement, either from the Crown or public?

'I am, with all duty and obedience,

'Your Grace's most humble servant,

'RI. BENTLEY.'

The proposition of Bentley was, as might have been expected, favourably received by Wake, himself a distinguished scholar, and who was reported, when at Paris some time before, to have made for his own behoof a transcript of the whole of the so-called *Codex Claromontanus*, — a manuscript containing the Epistles of St. Paul, with a Latin version, of the same age and character with the *Codex Bezae*. Bentley now set about furnishing himself with the materials for the execution of his design. He obtained a collation of the Vatican MS., the first, we believe, that ever was made, from Mico, then librarian at Rome. He sent over John Walker, a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, to Paris, to procure collations of all the treasures which existed in the several libraries of that city. This gentleman met at first with some little coolness from the superior authorities of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Maur, who imagined that his object, from the interest he displayed for Latin as well as Greek

* Jerome shared the scrupulosity of the authors of the so-called 'Itala Versio.' He says of himself (Ep. ad Pammachium), 'Ego enim non solum fateor sed etiam liberâ voce profiteor me in interpretatione Græcorum, absque Scripturis Sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est, non verbum e verbo sed sensum exprimere e sensu.' It is unfortunate that this point (of all others, perhaps, the most important in the classification of MSS.) should have been thought an immaterial one by Mr. Alford. (*Prolegomena*, p. 72.)

MSS., would probably interfere with an edition of the 'Vetus Italia,' about which some members of their own body were engaged. 'It's comical,' says Bentley, in a letter to Walker, 'that the Benedictine Fathers will not believe you, but fancy my scheme is the same with theirs, when it's just the reverse. They are seeking the old Italic Version, and I their Vulgate, and by it the Greek of Origen. I am too old to engage in so extensive a work as theirs, so they need not be jealous of me. If both works see the light, they'll illustrate each other, but not depreciate. If they'll be communicative, I can recompense it to them *et operâ et consilio*.' But the influence of the more learned members of the society prevailed over the ignorance and illiberality of the 'Præpositi;' and it is pleasing to see in an age of no common bigotry and religious exasperation, the humanising influence of letters. Montfaucon and De la Rue zealously and successfully pleaded the cause of a Protestant editor of the New Testament before the ruling body of the college. 'Vellem in eorum cœtu,' says one of the monks, writing to Bentley, 'vidisses D. Bernardum (Montfaucon), quam strenue Bentlicianas partes tueretur; turpe esse quidquam denegare Viro celebri qui nos tot et tantis beneficiis cumlaverat, qui tam propensâ voluntate non emendationes tantum, sed et libros ipsos trans mittebat; se, si suscepti operis auctor esset, relicturum potius et integrum Cantabrigiam missurum esse, quam Benedictino nomini tantam inferret injuriam.' After a little more explanation, Walker was not only allowed to consult the MSS., but assisted in every possible way by the worthy Fathers. 'I believe,' he says, in his next letter to Bentley, 'that they would do any thing with pleasure that you desired of them; and, if you please to order me, I will put them upon collating some of their MSS., while I am at work upon those of other libraries.' Indeed, he seems to have been completely petted by them. He caught a severe cold, which would have interrupted his task, 'if the Benedictine Fathers had not offered me a chamber with a fire to study in, in their Abbaye.' De la Rue calls him, 'Walkerus noster,' and adds, 'Nostrum eum dico, qui primum nobis ob tuam commendationem carus, postmodum ob exploratam morum ipsius suavitatem carissimus fuit.' As for Montfaucon, his first champion, he 'loved him as a son,' and through his influence procured him the privilege of having various MSS. brought from other libraries into the Benedictine Monastery for more convenient collation.

Walker was not the only assistant whom Bentley made use of. He had sent over Wetstein to Paris for similar purposes,

immediately after the favourable acceptance of his proposition by the Archbishop; and it appears that, among other things, he paid him 50*l.* for a complete copy of the *Codex Rescriptus* of Ephraem Syrus*, mentioned in his letter. He obtained four ancient manuscripts from the Chapter Library at Durham. He purchased every volume which he could hear of for sale on the Continent which was of undoubted antiquity; and, finally, acquired an *apparatus criticus* of an extent which would have taken away the very breath of the Elzevir editors. Independently of the four manuscripts (A, B, C, D), there are collations of eighteen Greek codices collected in one volume in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, averaging more than a thousand years each, and forming only a portion of the collection made by Walker.

But it was not reserved for Bentley to complete the plan which he had sketched out. His unhappy dispute with the Fellows of his own college is well known, and from the time it commenced his whole life became a prey to personal animosities of the bitterest kind. His enemies endeavoured as much as possible to discredit his qualifications for the task he had undertaken, and his own unpopular manners and unamiable disposition aided their efforts with those who knew little or nothing of the merits of the case, but hated the domineering spirit and the withering contempt habitually displayed by the English Aristarchus. These qualities had subjected him to the censures of the university, whose jurisdiction he had insulted; and public decency was scandalised by the spectacle of the most illustrious scholar of the age, and Regius Professor of Divinity, stripped of his degrees, and appearing in the garb of an undergraduate in the college of which he was master. He quarrelled with the Bishop of Rochester about the election of Westminster scholars to fellowships of Trinity College, and with the Archbishop of Canterbury (Wake) respecting the right of the latter to appoint a librarian. The wits all hated him for the castigation he had inflicted upon the Honourable Mr. Boyle in the controversy respecting Phalaris. Pope put him into the Dunciad as 'Slashing Bentley;' and it was represented that the sacred writings were likely to sustain the same treatment at his hands as some heathen authors. In his letter to Mill he had shown

* Ever since the time of Wetstein, the most important MSS. of the New Testament have been distinguished in critical editions by the following symbols: — A, the *Codex Alexandrinus*; B, the *Codex Vaticanus*; C, the *Codex Rescriptus Ephraemi Syri*; D, the *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*.

the existence of an interpolation in the Epistle to the Galatians, and in the Prælection which he composed when elected to the Regius Professorship, had proved the utter baselessness of the Vulgate reading in the celebrated verse, 1 John, v. 7.: and his enemies were not ashamed to take advantage of the prejudice which this was calculated to excite in the breasts of the ignorant. It must be confessed, that in the sequel Bentley himself took exactly the course most likely to confirm the erroneous judgment of him entertained by the world at large. His conjectural emendations of the Paradise Lost, which can scarcely have been meant as more than a practical jest on his part, were regarded generally as an insult on the common sense of mankind, and pointed to as a fair specimen of the critical pretensions of their author. Indeed, long before this it was obvious that his intended edition would never appear, and his enemies even went the length of asserting, that his original proposals were only made for the purpose of ingratiating himself with the Archbishop, and thereby strengthening his case against the Fellows of his College. That this was a mere calumny is quite certain. He himself, probably, never relinquished the scheme to the day of his death; but the last indication of his actively prosecuting it appears in a letter of the year 1729, from which it seems that the corrections and interlinear glosses made by a later hand in the Vatican Codex had appeared to him of sufficient importance to induce him to procure a collation of them from the Abbé Rulotta, who had succeeded to the place formerly filled by Mico at Rome.

Since the time of Bentley many additions (of very various value) have been made to the authorities upon which the sacred text is based. For the Gospels alone (or for considerable portions of them) there are now available ten or twelve Greek MSS., of which the most recent is above a thousand years old, with, perhaps, double the number of fragments of the same antiquity. Of books of more modern date (*i. e.* from the eleventh to the sixteenth century) there cannot be less than five hundred. Besides these there are some forty or fifty Evangelistaria (volumes containing extracts from the Gospels for reading in the public services of the Church), written in ancient letters, and three times the number in the cursive or modern character. Independently of this *matériel*, the verbal critic has most important resources in many manuscripts containing early versions, and, more than all, especially for the purpose of testing the value of the above, he has the quotations which are sprinkled throughout the writings of the early Fathers. It will be obvious that here no scarcity of documentary evidence has to

be complained of, and that the real difficulty consists in the proper appreciation of the testimony when the witnesses contradict each other. It is a remarkable circumstance, and one which, without the least wish to exaggerate, we cannot abstain from viewing as a manifest interposition of the hand of Providence, that this complicated problem, important as it is as a *literary* question, is entirely devoid of interest as a *theological* one. As a divine book,—as constituting the special aliment of our spiritual life,—as serving, like the Scriptures of the Old Covenant, for instruction, reproof, correction, and education in righteousness,—the New Testament remains of the same value, after all the changes which the principles of sound philology require to be made in the Elzevir Text. The Sixth Article of the Church of England requires no modification, whether we adopt the most interpolated or the purest of all existing MSS. Every portion of the Creeds admits of the same scriptural proof of which it was susceptible when the codices used by Stephens were supposed to be the best in existence. The private Christian, therefore, who has no call to examine into the matter, has neither any occasion whatever for disquietude. He may safely continue to regard the version he has been in the habit of using as a safe guide in all points which in the least degree concern himself. But the case is very different with those who are entrusted with the maintenance of the bulwarks of our religion. They are bound not to refuse investigations such as this subject suggests, whenever the occasion appears to demand them; and they are guilty of an act of treason to the God of Truth if they allow themselves to be alarmed by a fear that the cause of truth can be endangered by the most searching inquiry. It is a lesson which ought never to be forgotten, that by far the most perplexing of all the real difficulties which are found in the Sacred Text at the present day arise (as we shall presently explain) from an over-anxious timidity, which led to the *masking* of difficulties, which were merely apparent ones, many ages ago.

In the very outset of the question how to marshal the mass of evidence we possess, it is easy to see one point, viz., that, *ceteris paribus*, the testimony of the more modern MSS. must be very far less weighty than that of the most ancient. Independently of any particular circumstances affecting the question, no one would dream of attaching the same authority to a codex written in the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries, that he would to one which dated from the fifth or sixth. Whatever risk of alteration is inherent in the task of transcription, of course increases rapidly with the number of times which that task is repeated. If (as continually happens with all ancient authors)

one or more words have been placed in the margin as an explanatory gloss, and by the next transcriber taken into the text, from the impression that they were intended to supply an accidental omission in the former copy, it is plain that the chances of such a mistake are multiplied with every transcript. Now, if we suppose another case (which likewise continually occurs), namely, the comparison of one codex thus interpolated with another which has similarly suffered, but suffered in *different places*, the impression produced on the mind of the comparer (ὁ ἀντιβάλλων) will often be, that both his own copy, and that with which he is comparing it, have suffered by accidental omissions, and accordingly in a new transcript he will incorporate the additions which he finds both in the one and the other. Here then we have one obvious cause of error in multiplied transcription, independently of the constantly existing one arising from the inaccurate eye, hand, or temper of the copyist.

Besides this, however, there is another analogous corruption, arising from a somewhat different cause. From the time of Origen to that of Gregory the Great, considerable care seems to have been taken in the comparison of manuscripts with one another, whenever a transcript was made. This was rendered necessary by the corruptions of still earlier times*, which providentially forced a thorough investigation of the subject upon the most learned Fathers of the Church before the evil arrived at a pitch to baffle attempts at cure. When two manuscripts of equal apparent value were found to differ, the variation was noted in the margin of the transcript, and sometimes even more than one such was so placed, when more than one copy had been collated. It sometimes happened that on a second transcript being subsequently made, the whole of these were considered as a portion of the sacred context which had been omitted, and were accordingly moved from the margin and placed in immediate juxtaposition with the doubtful reading of which they were intended as alternatives.

One or two illustrations will make this part of the subject clear to the lay reader.

In Revelations, xxii. 11., the weight of the existing MSS. authority is in favour of the reading ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπαρευθήτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω

* Origen says, Πολλὴ γέγονεν ἡ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορὰ, εἴτε ἀπὸ ρηθυμίας τινων γραφῶν, ἢ ἀπὸ [τόλμης τινων] μοχθηρᾶς τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων, εἴτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν (legendum videtur ἀπὸ τόλμης τινων τῶν) τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει προστιθέντων ἢ ἀφαιρούντων.—Homil. in Matt. viii.

ἔτι, καὶ ὁ ἄγιος ἀγιασθήτω ἔτι. It will be observed here that there is a sort of double antithesis as regards the sense. This effect will also be produced even as regards the grammatical form, if the variations ὁ ῥυπῶν ῥυπωσάτω and ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοθήτω (which some MSS. and Versions followed by the Textus Receptus sanction) be substituted for the corresponding expressions. But in the Letter of the Vienne and Lyons Martyrs, (§. 15.), a document of the second century, we find the passage quoted with a far more important variation; ὁ ἄνομος ἀνομησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοθήτω ἔτι. Moreover in some other MSS., among which is the Alexandrine Codex, the clause ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπαρευθήτω ἔτι is entirely omitted, thus destroying the double antithesis. Now as in all cases of variation there can be but one real original, and the problem to be solved is to account from known causes for the rise of all existing differences, let us see how this principle may be applied in the present instance. First, there is a presumption in favour of the quotation in the letter on account of its antiquity, no MS. reaching anything like so far back. Secondly, the verbal antithesis is in it very far from being so striking as in the form which the MSS. furnish. Thirdly, the expression ἄνομος is somewhat vague, and the words ἀδικῶν and ῥυπαρὸς are explanations of it in its two phases, in its bearing on the Law of Justice, and the Law of Purity. There was therefore a reason for their finding a place (probably one after the other) in the margin as *explanatory glosses*. The variation δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω might likewise obtain a similar position as an explanation of the ambiguous δικαιοθήτω (*justificetur*). But if the next transcriber took these marginal notes not for *glosses*, but in their aggregate for *an alternative reading*, he would be struck by the defect of the antithesis in the sentence as it stood, ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπαρευθήτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω ἔτι, and would add, (likewise probably in the margin) the words wanting, to exactly complete the rounded phrase, καὶ ὁ ἄγιος ἀγιασθήτω ἔτι. As our object is not to do more than point out to readers unaccustomed to these subjects, the *kind* of phenomena which the criticism of the sacred text presents, we shall pass over the discussion of the more minute variations.

The passage Matthew, xxi. 28—31. exhibits a very curious instance of variation from the causes above mentioned. The greater number of the MSS. represent the master of the vineyard as applying first to the son who refused to obey his order to work, but afterwards 'repented and went.' Some, however, (including the Vatican Codex and the Syrian and Coptic versions) invert the narrative, and make the son first ordered to

reply, 'I go, Sir,' and to fall from his purpose. It is very obvious, that the *reply* to the question 'Whether of them twain did the will of his father?' (in verse 31.), must be 'the first' or 'the second,' according as the one or the other order in the narrative is observed. But, singularly enough, some of the MSS. and VSS. which relate the story *so as to require* the answer *ὁ πρῶτος*, really give *ὁ ὕστερος* (or its equivalents in sense *ὁ δεύτερος*, *ὁ ἔσχατος*, or 'novissimus.') Now that this puzzle existed in the time of Jerome, is plain from his commentary on the passage, 'Sciendum est in veris exemplaribus non 'haberi "novissimum" sed "primum." Si autem "novissimum" voverimus legere, manifesta est interpretatio ut dicamus intelligere quidem veritatem Judæos sed tergiversari.' If we go to Origen's commentary to help us out of the difficulty, we find no clue to indicate of which of the two readings spoken of by Jerome he had possession. On the contrary, there is *no allusion* to either the one or the other. And here, perhaps, is the key to the mystery. Did Origen find our Lord's words spoken continuously? * 'Whether of the twain did the will of his Father? Verily, I say unto you,' &c. &c. This is certainly the impression his commentary produces: and if it was the case, nothing is easier than to account for the strange variations. The eye of a transcriber who had just written the words *ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν*, fell upon the very same words two lines below, and instead of writing *οὐ θέλω ὕστερον δὲ μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπήλθεν*, he continued *ἐγὼ κύριε· καὶ οὐκ ἀπήλθεν*, before discovering his error. As, however, the appearance of his copy would have been spoilt by obliterating the words, and the sense was not (as the text then stood) affected by the change of order, he continued his task by simply attributing to the second son the words which in his copy he had found given to the first, and *vice versâ*. Accordingly, the writers of the subsequent marginal glosses would write *λέγουσιν ὁ πρῶτος* or *λέγουσιν ὁ ὕστερος* (*δευτερος*; or *ἔσχατος*;) just as the copies on which they commented were derived from one or the other source, the further addition *λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς* being equally applicable to both. But on the collation of a fresh copy, especially if the transcript were made by an uneducated person †, the marginal gloss would readily be

* See Matt. xvi. 9—11., compared with Mark, viii. 18—21.

† This was often the case where the new copy was intended for public service, and therefore of a sumptuous and splendid appearance, calligraphic skill being here an important qualification in the copyist. Such copies are full of false spelling, and the like blunders of ignorance; and this occasioned the cynical remark of Jerome upon them: 'Onera magis quam codices.' (Præf. in Job.) This expression,

transferred bodily to a text to which it was inapplicable without an appropriate change.

In all cases where the variations arise out of such causes as we have been describing, it is possible to decide upon the merits of the case (where any positive decision can be come to), without any special regard to the general character of the individual MSS. But this does not hold with another class of variations, which are of much older standing, and present much greater difficulty. Jerome, in his Preface to the new translation of the Gospels, which forms the basis of the modern Vulgate, speaks of this cause of error in very strong terms. The Evangelists in relating the same event had, as was to be expected, varied in minute details, one sometimes omitting a feature in the narrative which had been preserved by another, or giving a phrase as expressed by Our Lord which another had not recorded. The more carefully the sacred volume was studied, the more would these differences strike the reader. The first step would probably be to place the variations in the margin in the form of notes; a second to make a kind of Diatessaron by taking some one of the Evangelists as a basis, and interweaving into the web of his account the parallel narratives found in the other three. This indeed was the actual proceeding of Ammonius, a Christian philosopher of Alexandria, in the first half of the third century. He had, at the cost of much pains, drawn up such a scheme, of which the gospel of St. Matthew formed the framework, interpolating, in what appeared to be their appropriate places, the several portions of the other three;—so that (says Eusebius *) ‘he made one gospel out of four.’ It is obvious that, as regards the three inserted accounts, the thread of the narrative must have been entirely sacrificed by this proceeding: and accordingly Eusebius himself devised a scheme for securing whatever advantages such an arrangement might possess, without sacrificing the integrity of the three interpolated authorities. He composed the celebrated ‘Canons’ which have since gone by his name. They are ten in number. The *first* is a table, in parallel columns, of those portions of the sacred narrative which are common to all four of the Evangelists. The *second*, of those which are common only to the three, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The *third*, of those which are common to the three, Matthew, Luke, and John. The *fourth*, of those which are common to the three, Matthew, Mark, and John. The *fifth*, of

which merely amounts to saying ‘Correctness before Beauty,’ has been absurdly perverted to imply a disparagement of uncial MSS.

* Ep. ad Carpianum.

those which are common only to the two, Matthew and Luke. The *sixth*, of those common to Matthew and Mark. The *seventh*, of those to Matthew and John. The *eighth*, to Luke and Mark. The *ninth*, to Luke and John. The *tenth* contains a register of all the passages which are found only in one of the four. The mode of using these tables was a very simple one. Each Gospel was divided, by numbers written in the margin, into the portions of which it consisted, which in the case of St. Matthew, who had the most, amounted to 355; in that of St. Mark, who had the fewest, to 233. These numbers were written in black ink, and to each was added in red ink, the number of that table in which it was to be found. Thus, for instance, a reader of the account of the resurrection in St. Mark's gospel, would find appended to the paragraph contained in chap. xvi. 2—5. the number 231, and the class-mark 1. By the latter he would know that the passage was common to all four of the Evangelists, and turning to the table in which the register of such passages was found, he would see the *numbers* indicating the parallel paragraphs in Matthew, Luke, and John, viz. 352 (= chap. xxviii. 1—4.), 336 (= chap. xxiv. 1—4.), and 211 (= chap. xx. 11, 12.).

The advantage of this method above that of Ammonius is plain. It was adopted by Jerome in his new version, and the presence or absence of the Eusebian Canons and marginal numbers is a very valuable criterion at the present day, towards ascertaining whether Latin versions existing in ancient manuscripts have or have not been corrected from the Vulgate.

But the careful comparison of the several Evangelists which led to this ingenious arrangement had indirectly produced a serious evil. In every age, men of ordinary minds are prone to be dissatisfied with a substantial unity, and desire to strain it into an outward uniformity; and this spirit found scope for its exercise in a most unfortunate tendency to tamper with the sacred narrative in those portions which are diversely given by the different Evangelists. It seems to have been in operation for a considerable time. Jerome speaks of it as an inveterate practice, (especially, it would seem, in the Latin MSS. or in the Greek MSS. which were found in Italy)* to interpolate one

* His words are, 'Magnus siquidem in *nostris* codicibus error inolevit, dum quod in eadem re alius evangelista plus dixit, in alio, quia minus putaverint, addiderunt; vel dum eundem sensum alius alter expressit, ille qui unum e quattuor primum legerat, ad ejus exemplum ceteros quoque æstimaverit emendandos.'—Ep. ad Dama-

gospel from another in the parallel narratives in order to produce a more patent and literal agreement. That these efforts produced no effect upon the text of the Gospels, as regards their doctrinal or historical importance, we may be quite confident. The Christians had been, from the earliest period at which the necessity of appealing to written documents made itself felt, far too suspiciously watched by their enemies to allow of such a step. Celsus had made such a charge against them, and Origen was able to assert in contradiction of it that no others but Valentinus and Marcion, and their followers, were open to it. Origen himself, however, was quite aware of the alterations which such injudicious copyists as we are speaking of had introduced; as fully appears from the passage we have quoted above. The more learned Fathers, indeed, never display the least desire to blink the fact of variations existing in the copies of the sacred volume. Irenæus, in discussing the text (Rev. xiii. 18.), appeals in support of his views 'to the oldest and best 'copies;' and Jerome, in a letter to Augustine, displays no little irritation at the morbid apprehensions of the latter, lest the minds of the people should be unsettled by a correction which he had made of a false translation of a passage in the book of Jonah.* It is therefore as certain as any historical fact can be, that down to the time of Jerome *no corruption of DOCTRINAL importance* was introduced into the writings of the New Testament. The vigilance of the enemies of Christianity, and that of the more enlightened of its champions, equally contributed, under the guidance of Divine Providence, to secure this primary and necessary end. But it is no less certain that the blind zeal of the ignorant and narrow-minded produced a state of things which throws a great, perhaps an insuperable, obstacle in the way of a *perfect solution of the literary problem*, 'to determine 'the exact condition of the sacred writings at the time they 'proceeded from the pen of their respective authors.'

The same feeling which had produced the mischief of which Jerome complains, necessarily operated in preventing him from remedying the evil so thoroughly as he otherwise would have

* Augustin. Epp. lxxv. Jerome had substituted the word 'hedera' for 'cucurbita,' the original word denoting a plant which is neither the one nor the other. Augustine says, that one of his bishops adopted the change, and the people made such an outcry, that it became necessary to appeal to the Jews. They gave it for the 'cucurbita,' and the bishop, to avoid losing his flock, was obliged to declare the change was by mistake. Jerome tells Augustine, that if the Jews were not ignorant of Hebrew, they were only making game of the 'sucarbitarii.'

done. In his letter to Damasus, which is prefixed as a preface to the corrected translation, he professes himself to be quite aware of the invidious nature of the task he had undertaken at the bishop's request; he expects the learned and the unlearned to join in branding him with the name of a sacrilegious falsifier, when they find anything altered from the form which they had imbibed from their earliest years. However, he asks, if Latin authorities are to rule, which of them are to do so? for the authorities are nearly as numerous as the copies, (*tot sunt enim exemplaria pene quot codices*). Common sense requires that under such circumstances the original Greek should be made the standard. Accordingly he proposes to revise the Latin by collating it with Greek manuscripts, *but those ancient ones*; and to a certain extent to qualify this corrected edition, by abstaining from altering the existing version, except where alteration was necessary for the purpose of conveying a correct sense; (*quæ ne multum a lectionis Latinæ consuetudine discrepant, ita calamo temperavimus, ut his tantum quæ sensum videbantur mutare correctis, reliqua manere pateremur ut fuerant*).

Such was the principle upon which a work was conducted, which the sagacity of Bentley intuitively recognised as furnishing the first safe step by which criticism could ascend to the primitive form of the sacred text. The genuine Vulgate represents (if faithfully reproduced) the reading of Greek manuscripts, considered at the end of the fourth century as ancient ones by the greatest scholar of the Latin Church, only so far modified as a practical regard for the *consuetudo Latinæ lectionis* could be indulged without injury to the sense. It is a text constituted not on a rigidly scientific method, but on one of which the rigidly scientific character is affected by only a single influence, and that within fairly appreciable limits.

But here the question naturally arises, what was the probable quarter from which those 'ancient Greek MSS.' were derived, of which Jerome made use? This, it cannot be doubted, was Alexandria. Not only was that city the focus of Christian erudition, but the well-known admiration of Jerome for the labours of Origen, whose commentaries formed in many cases the source from which he drew his own, and the fact of the remarkable agreement between those MSS. existing at this day which have an Alexandrine origin, and the readings of the genuine Vulgate, put the matter out of all question. Scholz, in his edition of the New Testament, has attempted, and entirely failed in his attempt, to depreciate this family of manuscripts (which includes the most ancient in existence) in favour of the more modern codices (chiefly written in cursive characters),

upon which his own text is mainly based. Every defect which he has charged against them has been conclusively proved by Tischendorf, (in the preface to the first edition, Leipzig, 1841,) to attach, in far greater degree, to those upon which he places his main dependence; and the principle upon which Bentley proposed to construct a critical text, may be considered as now, after all the labours of intervening scholars which have been applied to the subject, placed beyond doubt.

But although this is the *first* step to be taken, it is not the *only* one which may be made by the skilful and cautious critic. Jerome expressly states, in his letter to Damasus, that he throws out of consideration one class of Greek manuscripts*, apparently varying from the others chiefly by additions,—on the ground that early versions manifestly showed that such additions had been a recent interpolation. Here then we have a finger-post pointing to at least a negative use to be made of ante-Hieronymian versions, such as the Syrian and the several branches of the Coptic. The former of these, at least, is accessible in several most ancient codices, one of which, apparently of extreme antiquity, is now in the British Museum, having been brought thither from the Natrian desert in the year 1847, and is, we believe, about to be published by Mr. Cureton. A few various readings are also given in Blanchini's *Evangelium Quadruplex* from four Syrian MSS. in the Vatican, which the collator describes as being 'miræ vetustatis.' It seems reasonable to expect that by an accurate comparison of all these, the Peschito text at least of the Gospels may be recovered as it existed at the end of the second century. A restoration of the Coptic, of a century later, is likewise a hopeful matter; and although we have no means of ascertaining what was the character of the Greek MSS.* from which these versions were taken, there is every presumption in favour of their quality. Finally, from the very Latin Versions, the diversity of which had caused so much perplexity in Jerome's time, no small harvest is still to be reaped. They were made from Greek MSS. in very early times, and whatever the quality of these may have been (and there is no antecedent presumption against its having been good), they represent, in some instances with great accuracy, the readings which existed in those manuscripts, — and thus furnish an additional witness, highly important at least negatively, in constructing a critical text. Some of the codices containing these versions are of very high antiquity;

* He describes them as 'eos codices quos a Luciano et Hesychio nominatos paucorum hominum assertit perversa contentio.'

and several of them possess such a mutual resemblance as to make it unquestionable that their common ancestor is a single Greek copy, probably written before the time of Origen, and belonging to another family than the Alexandrine. Two manuscripts containing the Gospels, published first by Blanchini in his *Evangelium Quadruplex*, under the names Codex Vercellensis, and Codex Veronensis, (from the libraries where they were found,) and a third in the library at Vienna, collated by Tischendorf, in his second edition, under the name of Codex Palatinus, are most remarkable specimens of this class. They appear to have great affinity with the singular Codex Bezae, and from their agreement with the citations of the Latin African Fathers, Tertullian and Cyprian, it has been plausibly conjectured that the origin of their archetypal text is to be looked for in that part of Africa; from whence, probably, copies were brought into Italy. They all agree with one another in the peculiar arrangement of the Gospels, placing them in the order Matthew, John, Luke, and Mark, — according to the relative dignity assigned by Tertullian, — apostles before apostolic men; an arrangement which, perhaps owing to the authority of Origen and Jerome, has gradually given place to the one commonly received, which is supposed to indicate Origen's opinion of the order in which the works severally appeared.

There is still another, numerically important, class of authorities which remains to be noticed. This consists of the more modern Greek manuscripts, which, as is natural, are almost all derived from that part of Europe and Asia in which the Christian ritual continued, to a late period, to be carried on in the Greek language. It was from manuscripts of this class that the New Testament was first printed, and their remarkable uniformity has induced some to contend that there is a presumption in favour of their having transmitted the text more accurately than any others. This view, which was the more readily received from the circumstance that it went towards restoring the shaken credit of the Elzevir text, was put forward by Matthæi, who published the New Testament from a large number of Moscow MSS., and it has since been acted upon by Scholz in his critical edition. But the uniformity which constitutes *prima facie* the recommendation of this family of codices, is found equally to prevail in the Latin MSS. of the eleventh and subsequent centuries which are found in Western Europe. This at once points to the cause of the phenomenon in question. The uniformity is in both cases a spurious one, superinduced by the close connexion which subsisted in the middle ages between the several churches in which the volumes were in use. The copies

were taken one from another without reference to age, or indeed anything else, except agreement with the text already in use. The few manuscripts belonging to this family (to which the name of Constantinopolitan has been given), which are of superior antiquity to the great bulk, exhibit the greatest number of variations from the Elzevir text, and approach the nearest to the codices which are derived from Alexandria.

We have now given the reader a sketch of the principal classes of authorities which exist for the constitution of a critical text; and he may judge how much remains to be done. In the first place supposing an *accurate* collation made of all existing MSS. (a work which has been performed for very few of the more modern, and by no means all of the old), *groups* must be formed of those which are found to represent the same archetypal transcript, and its date and country ascertained. This is not always so difficult as might appear to a stranger to the subject. Some of the MSS., especially the older ones, have appended to them notes which determine it. Thus a codex which was brought from Mount Athos* containing some fragments of St. Paul's Epistles, itself of the seventh century, has the notice that it was collated (ἀντεβλήθη) with a copy in the library of Pamphilus at Cæsarea, written by his own hand. It thus, so far as it remains, is an evidence for the readings of that volume, *i. e.* for the best text at Cæsarea in the beginning of the fourth century.

After the individual codices have been thus distributed into certain groups, the generic resemblance of those groups to one another will become more distinct, and their characteristic differences more salient; so as to permit of a new distribution of the groups themselves. In this process there will be gradually eliminated all the errors which have crept into the text from what may be regarded mere accidental causes; and there will remain in the ultimate arrangement only those broad and unmistakable variations which are due to differences in very early originals, belonging to widely dispersed localities. Then, as we believe, it will become by no means difficult to represent to the eye the text of the New Testament as it was read at Carthage, at Rome, in Gaul, in Greece Proper, in Asia Minor, at Antioch, at Cæsarea, and at Alexandria, at periods between the years 150 and 400,—and thus, by accurately ascertaining the

* This MS., which is denoted by the symbol H in Tischendorf, was published by Montfaucon, in the Bibliotheca Coisliniana. Although itself Constantinopolitan by country, Scholz is forced to allow that its text goes with the Alexandrine.

limits of what we may call its *structural* varieties, we shall be put in a position for discussing more profitably than is otherwise possible, the law which regulated the composition of its several parts. In the present state of things we believe this to be a most unpromising undertaking. The very dialect of the writings is an extremely uncertain question, and one which would have to be decided in a different manner according as one class or another of MSS. might be regarded as best representing the archetypal text. It has indeed, by some scholars, been tacitly assumed as an axiom, that the rugged Alexandrine forms and constructions which are found in the older MSS. must have been introduced by the grammarians of that learned city. But if so, why do we not find such forms in the writings of the most learned Alexandrines themselves, of Philo, Clement, and Origen? They exist only in the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, which is used by the writers of the New: and even if they are to be regarded as an adventitious garb, it seems at least as likely that such a one should have originally commended itself to the authors as subsequently to the copyists or commentators. But, in point of fact, the peculiar forms of the so-called Alexandrine dialect were, not improbably, the common property of the commercial population, (of which a large proportion were Hellenizing Jews,) throughout Palestine, Egypt, and 'the parts of Libya about Cyrene.'

Of the works we have placed at the head of this Article, the one which has contributed the most towards filling up the outline we have traced is the volume of Lachmann. The editor some years back issued a text, which has been stereotyped, but is little known in England. It is constructed entirely from those authorities which he regarded as representing the genuine readings of the fourth century in the East (a term in which he includes Egypt and Palestine). The present volume (which, however, extends only to the Four Gospels) attempts to give the testimony, both concurrent and divergent, of the ante-Hieronymian Latin Versions of the Western Church; of the Alexandrine Greek MSS.; of the Codex Bezae; of the genuine Vulgate of Jerome; and of the readings to be elicited from the writings of Origen, Irenæus, Cyprian, Hilary of Poitiers, and Lucifer of Cagliari. When his authorities *all* agree, he conceives that there is irrefragable evidence for the existence of the reading so warranted in Gaul, Italy, Africa, Alexandria, and Palestine, in the second or third century. If there should be any discrepancy in the authorities, a corresponding variation of evidence is indicated. For instance, in Matt. xix. 9. the readings vary thus:—

1. Ὃς ἀν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ [παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας] καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχᾷται.

This is the text sanctioned by the present representatives of the Italiano-African codices, and the Greek Codex Bezae.

2. Ὃς ἀν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ [παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας] ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὁ ἀπολειψμένην γαμήσας, μοιχᾷται.

This is the text sanctioned by the Alexandrine and Vatican MSS., and by Origen.

3. The Vulgate agrees with the Alexandrine MSS. in making two clauses, but with the Italiano-African versions in giving *mæchatur*, and not *mæchari facit*, in the former, — exactly what Jerome's principle would lead us to expect.

The words inclosed in brackets are varied in individual MSS. by the alternatives *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* and *εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*.

In Matt. xx. 22. The Italiano-African Versions, here also agreeing with the Codex Bezae, sanction the reading *δύνασθε πίνειν* (or *πιεῖν*) *τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ μέλλω πίνειν*; proceeding no further. Similarly in the next verse they proceed no further than *τὸ μὲν ποτήριόν μου πίεσθε*. In both these cases they are supported by the Vulgate, by the testimony of Hilary, and by that of Origen, who even asserts that the addition *ἡ* (or *καὶ*) *τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι* is to be found in Mark, but not in Matthew. But, although one of the ancient Alexandrine MSS. (B) agrees with this reading, the other (C) gives the addition which is found in the Textus Receptus. But when we turn to the parallel passage (Mark, x. 38, 39.), we find that the additional clause rests on the unanimous suffrage of all* the Alexandrine MSS., all the Italiano-African Versions, Jerome's Vulgate, and the Codex Bezae. Putting this evidence together with the statement of Jerome in his preface, it cannot be doubted that the second clauses *ἡ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι* and *καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθήσεσθε* in Matt. xx. 22, 23. were interpolated in Codex (C), or the MS. from which it was made, and in the archetype of the Elzevir MSS., to produce a more exact conformity with the text of Mark, while the existence of the duplication in the latter Evangelist rests on the unanimous evidence of MSS., Versions, and Fathers reaching up to the early part of the third century, and dispersed over widely separated regions.

* Here all the great Codices, the Alexandrine, Vatican, and Codex Ephraemi, come in with their evidence. In Matthew there is a gap in the first.

These examples will be sufficient, we think, to exhibit to the reader the beauty and satisfactory nature of the method pursued by Lachmann. It is undoubtedly true that he makes use of very few MSS.,—a necessary consequence of confining himself to those which are of extreme antiquity, and which are clearly defined in their character. But his highest praise is, that what he has done needs not to be done over again. Each separate portion of his work may be improved upon without pulling the whole to pieces. Such scholars as share the views of Matthæi and Scholz,—valuing highly the evidence of the modern manuscripts,—have only to pursue the process we have pointed out above, until they shall have concentrated the testimony of the individual codices in one or more clearly defined groups, indicating severally the text which prevailed at a given time in a given place, and approved by citations from the ecclesiastical writers belonging to the same era and locality. A similar course may be pursued with the different codices containing the *pure* Versions, and thus evidence elicited as to the condition of the Greek Text in Greece Proper, Syria, Upper and Lower Egypt, and the countries lying on the south bank of the Lower Danube. This will be tantamount to producing the testimony of the whole Christian world as to the condition of their copies of the New Testament during the third and fourth centuries of the Christian era; a result which, as is obvious, will involve the collateral advantage of determining, with extreme accuracy, the limits within which all variations from the very autographs must be included.

The publication of Tischendorf is of a much more ambitious character in its critical pretensions; but, in its practical excellence, we are disposed to place it far below the edition of Lachmann. The *apparatus criticus* is of enormous extent,—so great as to baffle all attempt at a systematic classification. Besides the Syrian and Egyptian Versions, the editor professes to give the variations (in their Greek equivalents) of the Ethiopic, Arabic, Armenian, Georgian, Gothic, Persian, Anglo-Saxon, and Slavonic Versions. Of these the two last were not made until the eighth and ninth centuries respectively; and all, with the exception of the Gothic, were derived not from Greek codices exclusively, but partially or wholly from Syrian, Coptic, and Latin Versions. This mixed and indefinite character renders them of very little use in the present stage of critical investigation of the text. Just as the smaller planetary bodies must be thrown out of consideration by the mathematician in his first determination of the moon's orbit, so must the hybrid versions be discarded by the sacred critic, until, from the purer materials,

he has succeeded in laying the solid foundations of his work. At a later period they will perhaps be of service in furnishing him here and there with a clue to some *residual* difficulty. But to marshal their evidence side by side with that of the authorities exhibited by Lachmann, is to fill up the ranks of a regiment of British grenadiers by a draft of Bosjeman recruits armed with their bows and arrows.

A yet more serious defect in this edition is the laxity with which it cites the authority of ecclesiastical writers for or against any given reading. The most ancient Fathers continually quote from memory, as is manifest by the same passage sometimes appearing three or four times with as many variations in the same writer. Of course this only occurs where the change involves no substantial alteration of the sense, and therefore, *doctrinally* speaking, is of no importance. But, as a matter of verbal criticism, the substantial importance of a variation is nothing to the purpose; while, on the other hand, all verbal changes, which proceeded from variations in the codices really used by an ecclesiastical writer, ought to be most carefully noted. It is a vital point, therefore, in recording the testimony of the Fathers, to make a distinction between those cases in which they *may be* quoting from memory, and those in which they *must be* quoting from manuscripts; and this can, in very few instances, be learnt from the margin of Tischendorf. Lachmann, on the other hand, where there is any doubt about the citation being a genuine quotation, gives a definite reference to the passage in which it occurs; so that the reader has it in his power to judge for himself of the merits of the case. This is a matter in which too great caution cannot be employed. Unless the argument of the writer shows unequivocally the text which he used, a *complete* certainty is never attainable as to his citations, it having been a continual temptation to transcribers to correct (as they fancied) these to a conformity with the copies of the New Testament which they themselves happened to use.*

Tischendorf has not only published an edition of the New Testament, but has likewise earned the gratitude of biblical

* A lamentable instance of this folly in the case of a Pagan author was furnished some years ago by Cardinal Maii. He published some exceedingly ancient Scholia on the Odyssey, and altered the quotations of the poet, which were imbedded in them, to suit the common printed text; thus acting as a man would do, who on finding an oyster should throw away the fish and put the shells in his pocket. It is singularly to be regretted, that the long-expected edition of the Vatican MS. is coming out at last under the auspices of so unfortunate a scholar.

scholars by a course which it is much to be regretted should not have been more generally adopted—the printing accurate transcripts, accompanied by specimen *fac-similes*, of some very important manuscripts. The *Codex rescriptus* (C) mentioned by Bentley in his letter to Archbishop Wake, is one of these. An ancient manuscript of the Gospels, in the old Latin version, discovered by himself at Vienna, is another. The rest are mere fragments, but of such an antiquity as to render their testimony very valuable as far as it extends. It is a remarkable circumstance that in a country so distinguished as England for associations of all kinds, not one should have sprung up for the special purpose of preserving in security, by means of the art of printing, these inestimable documents. With few exceptions, their evidence is available only in collations which have in many cases been very inaccurately made, while the original codices are every day becoming more and more impaired by the ravages of time, which in some cases are hastened by wantonness or culpable neglect. The *Codex Boreeli* (F) was lost soon after its collation by Wetstein, having probably been stolen. It was afterwards found in obscurity in a private collection at Arnheim, and is now deposited in the public library at Utrecht. But several leaves have in the mean time been torn out. The Alexandrine Codex nearly perished soon after its arrival in England. A fire occurred in the King's Library, and the book was saved, not without having suffered some damage, by being thrown out of window into the courtyard. The writing of the Vatican MS. was described by Bentley's nephew in the year 1726 as being *very white*, although very legible. The legibility had perhaps been to a certain extent preserved by that possessor of the volume who added the accents, which, although ancient, are much more recent than the text. 'He has taken,' says the younger Bentley, 'a strange piece of pains, to retouch every letter in the book; one side only sometimes when he thought the other side very plain; also, when he thought a letter superfluous, as in *δοθεῖς, περιψαυτες*, &c., he leaves the ε untouched.'

The business of collation is one extremely trying, both to the eyes and to the patience; and it is no matter of wonder that later editors should discover errors in the work of their predecessors. Tischendorf accuses Scholz of extraordinary carelessness in this respect, and professes likewise to have detected several oversights in Lachmann. He himself, however, has taken a course which entirely destroys the scientific character of his own *apparatus criticus*,—that is, often to abstain from giving the variations of codices in cases where he conceives

such variations to be undoubtedly interpolated: It is really difficult to conceive how any one who has ever had occasion to take the general character of a manuscript into consideration, and has therefore become aware how instructive even manifest errors are for this purpose, should have been tempted to this absurd step. Even supposing his judgment correct in the condemnation of each particular reading, its tacit exclusion from the margin vitiates the fundamental principle of a critical edition, which is valuable, not in proportion to the correctness of the text on which the editor happens to decide, but in proportion to the *means for deciding* on a correct text which it furnishes to the competent reader,—that is to say, in proportion to the *completeness* of its collations, and the *clearness* with which they are arranged. If these two principles be carried out, the natural consequence will be that every reading will appear, whether in the text or in the margin, supported by the amount of evidence belonging to it, and the student will be able (should he desire it) accurately to reconstruct out of the *apparatus criticus*, every one of the MSS. of which it is the *résumé*. But Tischendorf indulges in these reticences of various readings, not only when there is good ground for suspecting them to be interpolations, but even where it is positively certain that they have arisen from divergency in the archetypal codices,—that is, exactly in such cases as are most important when the problem of the primeval condition of the text has to be solved.

There is another very interesting point, to which it would be desirable that the attention of scholars should be more carefully directed than has hitherto been the case, viz., the alteration of Greek manuscripts from Latin ones. Some years ago an ingenious, but paradoxical, writer published a work which produced a great excitement at the time, in which he endeavoured to prove that the contents of the New Testament were originally written in Latin, or, at any rate, that the Greek copies which we have at present were re-translations from the Latin Vulgate. This theory was maintained with extraordinary cleverness, and an abundance of learned illustration; but in reading the book it is difficult to conceive that its author really believed it himself; although, like many other bold paradoxes, its refutation was scarcely an easier task than its reception. We believe that the substratum of plausibility which really existed as a foundation for this airy superstructure, is due entirely to the

* *Palaemonica, or Historical and Philological Disquisitions.* Murray, 1822.

fact to which we have just alluded. The main origin of the comparison of Greek MSS. with Latin ones is probably to be looked for in the intercourse which took place between some of the principal ecclesiastics of the Greek Church and the Church of Rome during the time of the Arian troubles. Among others, Athanasius and his successor Peter, in the fourth century, and John, also Bishop of Alexandria, in the fifth, passed a considerable time at Rome, and probably brought from thence not only an intimacy with the Latin language, but also copies of the Scriptures as used in the Latin Churches. Now nothing would be more natural than for the possessor of any one of these, when he found a discrepancy between the Greek Codex used in his own church and his new acquisition, to note the variation in the margin, either in Latin (as it existed), or in its Greek equivalent, or perhaps in both, the former for his own satisfaction, the latter for the information of his successors who might not be 'docti sermones utriusque linguæ.' The following examples may serve to show the manner in which this disturbing influence operated, and to direct the eye of the student to the many instances of it which exist as yet unnoticed.

I.—Marc. i. 41., ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἤψατο, κ. τ. λ. The Codex Bezae has the extraordinary variation ὀργισθεὶς instead of σπλαγχνισθεὶς. The Codex Veronensis omits the word altogether. The antiquity of the reading ὀργισθεὶς ('iratus') is confirmed by some of the old ante-Hieronymian versions. But it is manifestly an absurd one: and it is a plausible conjecture that it sprang up from a re-translation of the Latin word 'commotus,' which itself is indifferently the equivalent of ὀργισθεὶς and σπλαγχνισθεὶς. This is the notion of the paradoxical writer we have just spoken of. To us it appears more likely that 'iratus' is the relic of 'miseratus,' a marginal Latin interpretation of σπλαγχνισθεὶς (*Vulg.* misertus), of which the first two or three letters were worn away, and the rest obscured, in the copy from which the transcript of the MSS. α, δ, and some others, was made. Ὀργισθεὶς is, of course, the regular Greek equivalent of 'iratus.'

II.—Marc. xi. 8., the Textus Receptus has πολλοὶ δὲ (καὶ πολλοὶ B. C.) τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν, ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδας ἐκοπτον ἐκ τῶν δένδρων καὶ ἔστρωσαν (ἐστρώνονον D. a. b. c.) εἰς τὴν ὁδόν. For the last clause the Vatican Codex (B.) has the variation ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδας κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν. Now it is not at all difficult to conceive how both these readings might be derived from a common original, if it were not for the strange discrepancy between ἀγρῶν and δένδρων. But these words can never have been *directly* interchanged with one

another. The change must have come through a Latin version; 'arborum,' the translation of δένδρων, became readily altered into (or taken for) 'arvorum,' and the Greek equivalent of this (ἀργῶν) was placed in the margin as an alternative reading to δένδρων. The true reading is (we have little doubt) to be gathered from the combination of the two sources: καὶ πολλοὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἱστρώσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν, ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδας κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν δένδρων.

III.—Luc. xiv. 5. The reading of the Textus Receptus is τίνος ὑμῶν ὄνος ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται; if there were no variations in the MSS. there would be nothing here but what might be expected. The two animals, 'the ass' and 'the ox,' are continually coupled together in the Old Testament, and therefore may naturally be expected in connexion with one another here. But how to account for the extraordinary variation of the older Greek MSS.? With two exceptions the uncial codices all have the reading, τίνος ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται; 'Which of you shall have a son or an ox fall into a pit?'—a reading which is obviously an absurd one, but which is sanctioned not only by a large number of uncial MSS., but by some versions and ecclesiastical writers. Of the two exceptions the one is the Vatican Codex, which has ὁ υἱὸς (a reading which would witness against itself by the article, even if there were nothing suspicious about υἱὸς); and the other, the Codex Bezae, which furnishes a clue to the whole difficulty. That MS. has τίνος ἐξ ὑμῶν πρόβατον ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται; The Latin equivalent of πρόβατον (ovis) being written in the margin of a Greek MS. by way of *explanation* of the word, was no doubt taken by transcribers for a Greek word erroneously spelt, and indicating an *alternative reading*. One probably thought the initial letter forced out of its proper place, and that for ovis was to be read υἱός. Another, taking the initial letter for the article, thought that the o of the last syllable had been omitted, and that by ovis was meant ὁ υἱός, the reading of the Vatican Codex. Whether ὄνος is an arbitrary correction of the senseless reading υἱός, or whether there were two very early alternative readings, τίνος ὑμῶν πρόβατον ἢ βοῦς, and τίνος ὑμῶν ὄνος ἢ βοῦς, we will not pretend to determine. But we think no one, whose attention has been once called to the matter, will doubt for an instant that the reading τίνος ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς (which has far more weighty MSS. authority than any other), grew up in the way we have described through the intervention of a Latin version.

The edition of Mr. Alford is, so far as the *apparatus criticus* goes, entirely based upon the collations of Scholz, Lachmann,

and Tischendorf; and, of course, shares in whatever defects may exist in these. His arrangement of various readings is much more agreeable to the eye than those of his predecessors; and he has adopted a typographical contrivance as useful as it is simple, by means of which the reader observes, at the beginning of every page, what primary authorities exist for the constitution of the text. A little extension of this, to show with equal facility where a *lacuna* commences in any one of these, would be a further improvement. But we cannot bestow undivided praise upon this part of his work. He has lost sight of the distinctions carefully observed by Lachmann, has very much under-valued the ancient codices containing the Latin versions*, and has encumbered his margin with confirmations of lections from ecclesiastical writers which it is impossible to verify for want of references. The number of variations, likewise, which he has excluded from mention, as unimportant to the sense, is so great, that the character of the several MSS. is in many cases effectually masked by their concealment. The Alexandrian forms *εἶπαν, εἶχαν, ἐλθάτω*, &c. — the insertion or omission of the article before proper names, the insertion or omission of the words *αὐτός*, or *Ἰησοῦς*, or *αὐτοῖς*, or *πρὸς αὐτὸν*, &c. — the variations which occur in the connexion of sentences, such as *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, εἶπεν οὖν*, &c. — and ‘mere transpositions of words,’ are all included among Mr. Alford’s reticences. But if importance to the sense is to be the sole condition on which a variation may claim admittance into the margin, the book might have been yet diminished in bulk very considerably. At present the *apparatus criticus* labours under the fault of being both incomplete and cumbrous, — almost useless to the professed scholar, and quite unmanageable by the student. The accounts, too, of the several MSS. are far too meagre to convey any real information of their character to any one who is not already tolerably well acquainted with them; and some of the statements are very inaccurate, apparently from the circumstance of an undue reliance being placed upon the description of an intermediate authority. Thus, for instance, the account which is given of the principle upon which Lachmann classifies his authorities, as dividing them into primary and secondary, is calculated to produce a very false impression of the method really pursued by that distinguished scholar. Again, apparently following only

* Of these Bentley says in a letter to Wetstein, ‘Hujusmodi Latinos veterrimos vel Græcis ipsis prætulimus.’ This preference, it should be remembered, was with reference to the special purpose he had in hand.

the account of Tischendorf, Mr. Alford describes the Bentleian collation of the famous Vatican Codex as being made by 'Thomas Bentley, who was sent to Rome by his uncle, the great Bentley, for that purpose; and was assisted by Mico, an Italian.' Thomas Bentley himself tells a very different story. 'Mico is dead,' he says in a letter to his uncle (March 25. 1726); 'but there's an able young man in his place.' All that he himself did was to verify the collation of Mico: — 'I send you the collation, that you may see whether 'tis the same with Mico's. I opened at random, and fell upon the latter part of the Acts; so began the 27th chapter. . . . Besides the 27th of the Acts, I did a chapter in the Epistle to the Galatians, and another to the Ephesians. You'll have them in the next.' (Aug. 2. 1726.) Three years afterwards Bentley, who probably had been curious to know every particular of this venerable codex, obtained, through the agency of Baron Stosch, a copy of the *interlineary and marginal readings*, which was made by the Abbé Rulotta, who got forty scudi for the job. (*Letter from Baron de Stosch in the Bentley Correspondence*, July 9. 1729.) These circumstances are thus mixed up by Tischendorf, whom Mr. Alford takes unsuspectingly as his guide: — 'Thomæ Bentleii, quem ad id negotii Romam miserat avunculus Ricardus celeberrimus, collationem factam *potissimum* Miconis Itali manu transcripsit Woidius, transcriptamque edidit Henricus Ford in appendice ad editionem Novi Testamenti e cod. ms. Alexandrino 1799.' These and such like inaccuracies are perhaps of no great importance in themselves; for the whole portion of the volume in which they occur will probably be passed over by ninety-nine readers out of every hundred: but they ought not to have been incurred by any one who takes upon himself the responsibility of discussing the various philological problems of the New Testament Text in such a manner as to attract a class of readers that *must* take his assertions on trust.

Mr. Alford, in eighty-eight pages of Prolegomena, has attempted to discuss the weighty questions relative to the composition of the Four Gospels, to which we have alluded above. Perhaps it was necessary, from the comprehensive character which he has given to his notes, that this should be done; as otherwise the principles upon which some of his best explanations rest might be misunderstood. But the extent of the subjects he has entered upon is such, that even the most learned and diligent might well be excused for treating them somewhat inadequately; and this, haste and the desire of compression has in several instances compelled him to do. He considers the testimony of the early ecclesiastical writers conclusive as to the fact

that the Gospel of St. Matthew was originally written in Hebrew (*i.e.* the vernacular language of Palestine), while he treats as entirely futile the statement that the Gospel of St. Mark was composed under the influence of St. Peter. In weighing the authorities for the latter statement, he says ‘we may observe that the matter to which they refer is *not one of patent fact*, — such as Matthew’s Gospel having been originally composed and published in Hebrew, — but one which could, from its nature, have been known to very few persons.’ This is, it appears to us, a very erroneous statement of the case. The close connexion of St. Peter with St. Mark as his companion and spiritual son appears from 1 Pet. v. 13. St. Mark’s mother was the Mary, to whose house Peter resorted immediately after his miraculous delivery from prison. (Acts, xii. 12.) And if St. Mark did follow the authority of the Apostle in his compilation, this would be ‘a patent fact’ on the very instant of its publication; for the whole of its authority would be derived from that very circumstance. On the other hand, the existence of a Gospel by St. Matthew in the Hebrew language is completely a matter of hearsay until the time of Jerome. Papias (ap. Euseb. iii. 39.) does *not* give the fact as on the authority of John the Presbyter — which Mr. Alford states him to do, — although he does explicitly quote John as the source of what he says respecting St. Mark. And the expression which Eusebius applies to Papias, ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα λογιώτατος (which Mr. Alford strangely considers to imply the ‘giving him all weight as an historic witness’), is perfectly explained by the Bishop of Hierapolis himself in the very same chapter of Eusebius’s History. He entertained the very natural feeling of intense interest for every anecdote which he could gather from such as had themselves conversed with any of the favoured number that saw with their own eyes, and touched with their own hands, the Incarnate Word. ‘If any one happened to arrive,’ says he, ‘who had kept company with the elders, I used to inquire of them the stories told by the elders. What did Andrew, and what did Peter say? what Philip? what Thomas? what James? or what does John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord’s disciples? and Aristion, and John the Elder [the disciples of the Lord]* — what do they say? For my notion was, that what I got out of the books did not do me so much good as what I heard from the living voice still remaining.’ This disposition, of course, made him ‘a man full of anecdotes on all subjects,’ and is quite compatible with that ‘meagre understanding’ (σφόδρα σμικρὸς τὸν

* The words in brackets are probably an interpolation.

νοῦν, Euseb. iii. 30.) 'which appeared from his works,' and which made him, among other half-fabulous (μυθικώτερα) stories, relate that a millennium reign of Christ in the flesh was to come to pass upon the existing earth. But it renders him a very uncertain authority for a story which involves so many difficulties as the Hebrew original of St. Matthew's Gospel. The testimony of Irenæus we indeed have no right, as Mr. Alford says, to consider as *necessarily* derived from Papias. But what does it amount to? 'Matthew,' he says, 'published a written gospel among the Hebrews, while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel and laying the foundations of the Church in Rome.' This according to Mr. Alford's allowing, cannot be earlier than 61 A.D. But long before this the Gospel had been preached far and wide among the Gentiles; and is it likely that the Christians of Palestine should all the time have depended on solely oral instruction; and still that it should *afterwards* have been found necessary to record the staple of this, not in the Greek language, which would insure its wide circulation, but in the vernacular dialect? And even if so written, and at so long an interval after the events which it relates, is it likely that it would have been incomplete to such an extent as to omit all account of the Ascension? — or that if it had contained this, the translator and compiler of the existing Gospel would not have inserted it? All these difficulties follow at once from the statement of Irenæus, that the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew was written *while St. Paul was in Rome*. But this statement is the only thing which gives a distinctive character to his authority. If we separate this portion from the rest, by supposing it a mere error of calculation on the part of Irenæus, it is difficult to conceive the residue as reposing on any other foundation than the tradition recorded by Papias.

Besides these two authorities, Mr. Alford relies upon the tradition (ap. Euseb. H. E. v. 10.) that Pantænus, on his arrival as a missionary in India, found the gospel of St. Matthew there, written *in Hebrew letters*, and said to have been left by St. Bartholomew. This is probably a different tradition from the one of which Papias is the source, but the same with that which Origen (ap. Euseb. H. E. vi. 25.) gives. Their identity is shown by the description of the work. It is not said to be written Ἑβραϊστὶ, but Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν. And Origen's statement does not only exist in Eusebius, but in the extant commentary on St. Matthew, where he himself states (which is not quite clear from Eusebius) that 'a tradition' is the source of his information. When we consider that Clement of Alexandria was his master, and Pantænus Clement's, the identity of the

tradition becomes clear beyond all doubt. The combination of the two traditions appears in Epiphanius, another of Mr. Alford's authorities—strangely enough! as he expressly identifies the 'Hebrew' Gospel of St. Matthew with the Gospel καθ' Ἑβραίων, which he asserts to be used by the Ebionite and Corinthian heretics;—ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἐστιν εἰπεῖν ὅτι Ματθαῖος μόνος Ἑβραῖστὶ καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν, κ. τ. λ.

These are the only authorities brought by Mr. Alford which, properly speaking, can be said to exist for the puzzling statement of St. Matthew having written his Gospel in Hebrew. The others on which he relies, will rather help us to explain it. These are Eusebius and Jerome. The former, says Mr. Alford, shows 'that he *himself* believed St. Matthew's Gospel to have 'been written in Hebrew.' He undoubtedly states incidentally that such was the case, and that the expression ὄψε τοῦ σαββάτου (Matt. xxviii. 1.) came from the translator. But it seems pretty plain that in saying this, he did no more than acquiesce in the opinion current at Cæsarea, his native city, that the Syro-Chaldaic gospel in the library of his friend Pamphilus there, was the original of St. Matthew. Now this, it is *positively certain*, was nothing more than a version from the Greek of the Gospel καθ' Ἑβραίων. Jerome himself at first thought that it was the authentic Matthew, and translated it into both Greek and Latin from a copy which he obtained at Berœa in Syria. This appears from his Catalogue of Illustrious Men, written in the year 392. Six years later, in his Commentary on Matthew, he spoke more doubtfully about it,— 'quod vocatur a plerisque Matthæi authenticum.' Later still, in his book on the Pelagian heresy, written in the year 415, he modifies this account still further, describing the work as the 'Evangelium juxta Hebræos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed *Hebraicis literis* scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum Apostolos, sive, *ut plerique autumant*, juxta Matthæum, quod et in Cæsariensi habetur bibliotheca.' Few persons will doubt that this Syro-Chaldaic document, *written in Hebrew letters*, was what Pantænus found among the 'Indi,' which are to be looked for far west of what we understand by India; and that its existence, combined with the vague report of Papias, constitutes the sole foundation for the assertion of Eusebius. Thus the casual remark of a professed anecdote-collector, whose judgment is entirely disabled by the historian who records it, is, after all, the sole foundation for the statement that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. So little is Mr. Alford justified in terming this opinion one 'in accordance

‘with the testimony of the early Church, unanimous as it is, and derived from so many independent sources.’*

The external testimony to the influence of St. Peter on St. Mark's Gospel may or may not be deserving of implicit credit, but it is unquestionably much fuller than that to the Hebrew original of the Gospel of St. Matthew. The testimony of Irenæus is the same for both facts. That of Papias himself is exceeded by the statement of John the Presbyter, expressly cited by Papias. Besides this there is the evidence of the African, Tertullian, as regards St. Mark. And finally, (a passage which has escaped Mr. Alford's notice,) Justin Martyr, in one of the very few passages in which he distinctly refers to St. Mark's Gospel, actually quotes it as the ἀπομνημονεύματα of *Peter*. (Mark, xii. 16—18., quoted in the Dial. c. Tryph. §. 106.) Any conclusion from internal evidence as to what, under such circumstances, would have been contained, or what omitted, must be extremely uncertain, even if the original structural character were more accurately ascertained than is at present the case. It is a curious circumstance that a passage (xvi. 7.) which Mr. Alford points out as a remarkable proof that St. Peter *cannot* have superintended the composition, is put forward by another ingenious writer † among the evidences that he did.

The final paragraph of the Gospel of St. Mark, xvi. 9—20., is deficient in the Vatican Codex, and did not find a place in

* The haste which necessarily results from undertaking too comprehensive a task, shows itself in this part of Mr. Alford's work very palpably. Thus a passage from Clement of Alexandria, referring to the *existing Greek Gospel*, is combined with one from Irenæus, which relates to the *hypothetical Hebrew* one (p. 26.). Again, Jerome is produced as an authority for the Hebrew Matthew, as existing in the library at Cæsarea, in a passage where he positively identifies the Cæsarean Gospel with the Gospel according to the Hebrews (p. 24.); and yet, at the same time that he does this, Mr. Alford quotes a German writer, Ebrard, as plainly showing, ‘that whatever similarity these documents may have had to the Gospel of Matthew, *they were always regarded as distinct from it*’ (p. 23.). We are not acquainted with Ebrard's work, but cannot conceive him to rest on any stronger ground than the many passages in Jerome (*e. g.* Comm. in Matth. xii. 10., Id. in Matth. xxvii. 54.), in which their distinctness is shown plainly enough; but it is a distinctness from the existing *Greek*, not the imaginary *Hebrew Gospel*.

† Townison, Discourses on the Four Gospels, p. 146. It is almost mortifying to find so many positions of this acute and agreeable writer break down, as is the case when the various readings are considered.

the Eusebian Canons. In the *Catenæ*, no commentary exists upon it. In one of the MSS., a note states that an alternative reading of about seven or eight lines exists in some copies. Another mentions that although omitted as spurious in the greater number of copies, the writer found it in some accurate ones, among which was 'the Palestine Gospel,' and accordingly preserved it. In an ante-Hieronymian VS. there is an alternative for verse 19. Jerome in one place asserts that the paragraph is wanting in almost all the Greek copies (ad Hedib. 9. iv.); but in another place maintains the opposite opinion (c. Pelag. ii. c. 15.). It is said to be deficient in the Sahidic Version, but to be found in every other except the Arabic. In the Armenian, however, it is separated from what goes before. The 19th verse is quoted by the Latin Irenæus, expressly, as in the end of St. Mark's Gospel. But several ancient ecclesiastical writers (which may be seen in Wetstein's note) show that there was a great diversity in very early times. The difficulty of reconciling the statements contained in it with those of Matthew, undoubtedly disposed some of the Fathers to wish to be rid of it. On the other hand, the style is no doubt somewhat different from the rest of the Gospel, and presents the appearance rather of an epitome of events than a narrative. Mr. Alford points out some of these peculiarities, and after weighing all the evidence, comes to the conclusion that the probability is against its being the genuine production of the Evangelist, but that its *authenticity* and *authority* are beyond any question, and that it possesses *just the same claim to reception and reverence as the rest of the Gospels*. On the contrary, Cardinal Cajetan considers that the suspicions entertained of the passage by the early writers, prevent its use for doctrinal purposes. And if it be remembered that the issue is not only between its rejection and retention, but involves the further question of the value of several alternative readings (a point which Mr. Alford does not take into account), it seems rash to regard it as standing on so firm a basis as what precedes it.

We do not think Mr. Alford fails so much in any point, as in his criticism of the statements made by the early Ecclesiastical writers respecting the authorship of the Gospels. His arbitrary assumption of the Hebrew original of St. Matthew, and his equally arbitrary rejection of the account which makes the narrative of St. Mark rest on the authority of the Apostle Peter, we have already noticed. He also throws over the statement (certainly not in itself improbable) of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen, that St. Luke's Gospel reposes on the authority of St. Paul, with the bold assertion, that this is

‘contradicted by the express assertion of the Evangelist himself in his preface, that the Gospel was compiled and arranged by himself from the testimony of those who ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, *from the beginning of his history, were eye-witnesses or ministers of the word*, among whom it is not, of course, possible to reckon Paul.’ We would not assert that these were not St. Luke’s sources of information: but he certainly does not say they were. What he says is, that the accounts which had already been framed by many rested on the authority of those who had been eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word from the beginning [of our Lord’s ministry], as Mr. Alford himself (in his note on the passage) properly interprets the preface. He then says that ‘he, having carefully followed up every thing *from the very first*,’ (*i. e.* the annunciation of the birth of our Lord’s precursor, the Baptist), determined to add a regular history of his own. Surely nothing but extreme haste can explain the summary rejection of a fairly authenticated tradition on really no grounds at all. And it cannot be said that the tradition looks like a fiction to account for any notice either in the Gospel or the Book of Acts which suggests who was their common author. If we were left entirely to the internal evidence of the case, it would be at least as likely, perhaps more so, to infer that Timothy was the author, as Luke. We cannot help, therefore, contending that Mr. Alford has here been guilty of a piece of most gratuitous injustice to the commonly received account. Neither is he (we think) more happy when he strives to make up by internal evidence for the external evidence which he has rejected. Two of the passages which he cites (Gal. i. 12.; Ephes. iii. 3.), surely relate not to a communication of *historical facts*, — which must have undoubtedly been familiar to Paul while he was a persecutor, — but to a spiritual enlightenment which *interpreted* all the facts, and showed them to him in their true bearing, working in him the intuition that the Divine Dispensation which he was resisting was the fulfilment of ‘the hope of Israel.’ In Cor. xi. 23. the variations ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου, and ἀπὸ θεοῦ throw a great suspicion on the genuineness of any one; and the examination of the MSS. in Luc. xxii. 19 seqq. will, we think, incontestably show that the correspondence of that passage with the account in the First Epistle to the Corinthians is due (in those codices where it appears) to a later hand than the Evangelist. The only remaining passage urged by Mr. Alford (1 Cor. xv. 4.) proves nothing at all, except that the fact mentioned in it occurred, and was of course notorious. If St. Luke had derived his knowledge of it *merely* from St. Paul, how is it that he does not also relate the appearance of

the Lord to the 'five hundred brethren at once,' and that to 'James.' The argument derived from the observation of 'a similar cast of mind and feeling' in the Apostle and the Evangelist, and some others even more fine-drawn, we do not choose to enter into. They appear to us infinitely more uncertain than the vaguest statement which the credulity of a Papias or a Hegesippus ever indulged in: and we think that the castigation which Mr. Alford is, in the course of his commentary, somewhat too much in the habit of inflicting, either by words or bitterer notes of admiration, upon his German predecessors in philological matters, would be no less well bestowed now and then upon some of their didactic interpretations, of which he entertains a more favourable opinion.

We have occupied so much space in examining Mr. Alford's views respecting the composition of the Synoptic Gospels, that we can spare very little for that of St. John. In fact, we are disposed to go along with him here in most of his opinions, even in that one in which he differs from the prevalent view, which regards the fourth Gospel as written with the object of furnishing a supplement to the other three. We so far agree with Mr. Alford, as to think that the tradition to this effect arose out of an imagined suitableness (although he is in error in saying that Origen and Clement do not appeal to a tradition): but, at the same time, we are not sure that, when the text of the four Gospels has been restored as near to its primitive form as we believe to be possible, the phenomena, which seem opposed to this theory, may not in some degree disappear. As to the genuineness of the book, the arguments against it are, for the most part, so futile, as hardly to require a serious refutation. The view which he gives from Luecke of its relation to the other three, and of the character of the age and section of the Church in which the Evangelist lived, is so clear and luminous, as in itself to furnish every reader with a reply to possible objections.

We will conclude with the notice of one other point, which will be suggested to the English reader by the views which Mr. Alford puts forward relative to the *oral accounts*, which he considers to form the basis of the sacred histories. These oral narratives have nothing in common with the 'Oral Tradition,' with which the public has of late been dosed *usque ad nauseam*, — a fictitious abstraction, originally taken up by Gnostic heretics in order, *coute qui coute*, to reconcile their absurd philosophy with the plain and simple statements of the Apostolic writings. The problem of the Origin of Evil made them desire to combine the profession of Christianity with the notion that the Creator

of the Universe was not the Supreme Being; and as, of course, not a page of Scripture could be taken in its natural sense without exhibiting the blasphemy of such a tenet, they broached the insane theory that the Apostles themselves communicated the real knowledge of divine things not in writing, but orally, and in views utterly opposed to their written teaching (Irenæus, iii. cap. 2.). They based an imputation, at which common sense and common honesty equally revolt, on two passages of St. Paul, 1 Cor. ii. 6.: 'Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought; but we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery;' and 2 Tim. i. 14.: 'That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.'* This 'Oral Tradition' is the genuine ancestor of the *technical παράδοσις* (as contradistinguished from *γραφή*), which has been adopted into the Romish Church, and sanctioned by a decree of the Council of Trent,—the fruitful parent of *non natural* interpretations and dishonesty of every kind. The *παράδοσις* of the earliest Christians is not a *technical term* at all, but a mere general expression, inclusive of every thing which had been received relative to Christian faith or Christian practice, whether written or unwritten,—a sense in which it is constantly used by St. Paul.

In the first days of the Faith *every thing* was unwritten *ex necessitate rei*; not from any especial regard for that mode of communication, but because there was no reason apparent for adopting any other, and this mode was an obvious one. Those who had been made partakers in any degree of the enlightening Word of Truth, went away telling others what they had heard and seen. But of the many who did this, *only* the chosen few, on whom the Holy Spirit had descended in all his fulness, preserved the divine transaction in all its integrity,—only the SENT were endowed with the constant and unvarying spiritual discernment,—the plenary inspiration, which preserved them, as in a panoply of proof, from all alloy of the astounding errors which were rife in those days. The divine fire which warmed their hearts, remains even to this day, in the records which they left behind them, 'to be the foundation and pillar of the faith.'† But, in the meantime,

* This last appears from Tertullian, De Præscript. hæretic. § 25. The verse has since been used for a somewhat analogous purpose by some Anglican divines, who would have found their own theory refuted by anticipation, if they had taken the pains to study Irenæus instead of the preface of his Jesuit editor (Massuet).

† Irenæus, iii. cap. 9.

from this heavenly gift it resulted, that, although everywhere else heresy and schism, pride and vanity, and philosophy coupled in an unblest union with a bastard Christianity, engendered monstrosities of every kind, whose authors, 'bringing unhallowed fire in their censers to the altar of God, drew down on their heads the judgment of Nadab and Abiud,' the spiritual children, and children's children of the holy Twelve, still possessed 'the sure blessing of the TRUTH.*' Even in the most barbarous regions, where the merest elements of civilisation were unknown,—where, from the arts of reading and writing not existing, such a thing as a written Gospel had never been seen,—even in such countries 'the unlettered Christian would,' says Irenæus, 'should the Gnostic theories be named to him in his own tongue, put his hands in his ears and fly to avoid hearing such blasphemies.' The difference between the heresies and the true Church in those early days, was not the difference between the vagueness of oral tradition and the distinctness of written documents, but between Apostolic and non-Apostolic sources for the teaching of whatever kind. The heretics had their written Gospels; and they were much more numerous than the authentic ones.† And, from the Epistles of St. Paul, it is evident that, wherever he went, he preached all the main facts of the Gospel history‡ for many years before the earliest of the existing Gospels could have been composed. It must not be supposed that the infant Church, just leaping from her cradle, immediately took thought for the permanently recording those events which formed her actual life. It is as absurd as to imagine a parent, however wise, while in constant daily intercourse with his child, carefully day by day putting his precepts into writing. It is not until the child has left home and been exposed to the influence of others, and perhaps begins to show the bad effects of that intercourse, that the necessity forces itself upon the parent of putting his counsels into a permanent shape. Just such a case is that which Mr. Alford's theory of the origin of the Gospels implies; or, rather we may say, such are the undoubted historical facts. But this relative order, in point of time, between oral teaching and teaching from

* Irenæus, iv. cap. 26. *Charisma veritatis certum.*

† *Ecclesia quattuor habet Evangelia; hæresis plurima.*—Origen. *Homil. i. in Lucam.* preserved in Jerome's Latin version (*Opp. vii. p. 248.*).

‡ Compare, for instance, the passages, 2 Thess. ii. 15., 1 Cor. xv. 1—8., 2 Tim. ii. 8. with Tertullian. *De præsc. h. § 13. De virg. vel. § 1.*

Scripture, has no more bearing upon the point at issue between the Romish and the Reformed Communions, than the considerations just now adduced as an illustration would have upon the question whether, if Shakspeare had left descendants, his turn of thought would be gathered with greater probability by talking with them, or by reading his works ?

We cannot but think, that, whatever errors of detail Mr. Alford may be chargeable with in the course of his commentary, they are much more than made up for by the truthful and earnest spirit which prevents him from ever patching up the difficulties which occur to him; and, although we do not go with him in his extreme suspicion of the statements which have come down from Christian antiquity, we entirely share his antipathy for the arbitrary proceedings of modern harmonists. He has done good service by giving, we hope, the *coup de grace* to a system which is productive of more mischief to the cause of true religion than the efforts of any one open enemy of Christianity that ever lived; and, although we cannot but fear that he has exposed himself to unnecessary obloquy by casting off the veil afforded by the common language of the learned, we are quite certain that such censure will not proceed from any one who has made himself competent to give an opinion on the subject.

ART. II. — *Notes on North America, Agricultural, Economical, and Social.* By JAMES W. F. JOHNSTON: Edinburgh and London, 1851.

QUITE the most valuable, and often the most interesting books of travels, are those written by parties who have visited the countries they describe, with a distinct and special purpose; who, having some peculiar branch of study, or subject of interest of their own, direct their attention in a paramount, if not an exclusive manner, to whatever bears upon these matters, and bring home the results of an observation pervaded and enlivened by some favourite hypothesis, and distinguished from the productions of vaguer and more desultory inquirers, by a thorough comprehension of the topics of which they treat. It is true that such men, if not strictly on their guard, are in danger of having their observations somewhat warped and coloured to harmonise with a foregone conclusion, of seeing facts through the spectacles of a cherished theory, of ignoring or overlooking phenomena which might modify or overthrow their views; but we think that this peril is fully counterbalanced by the more vivid reality imparted to their delineations, and the more thorough

mastery of the matter in hand, which generally stamp the productions of the writers we are speaking of. America has been more than usually fortunate in the number of such travellers who have visited her shores. If Mr. Mackay's sketches of the Western World comprehend more or less of the entire panorama, she has been represented under almost every special phase and by observers of every class. Men of trained intellect in their several departments have looked at her from all possible points of view, and in the most favourable and unfavourable lights. Hamilton, Basil Hall, and Marryat described American 'Men and Manners' as they appear in general society, and to writers of aristocratic tastes. Stuart and Miss Martineau depicted social life and character according to the estimate of parties of boldly and democratic tendencies. De Beaumont confined himself chiefly to the subject of Slavery, and all its wide-spreading influences. Tocqueville studied the United States with the eye of a profound political philosopher. Reid and Mattheson went out as congregational divines to see how far Christianity can hold up its head in a country where there is no Church Establishment. Sir Charles Lyell regarded the American Continent as a geologist, and examined its features with the acuteness and comprehension of a mind of the highest scientific order. And now Mr. Johnston gives us the aspect in which it presented itself to the investigation of an Agricultural Professor, master of the art of cultivation in the Old World, and setting out with the specific purpose of examining and describing the capabilities and peculiarities of the New.

The most important part of Mr. Johnston's work is that which relates to the Provinces of British North America, respecting which Englishmen in general know far less than of the United States. Vast as is the extent of these colonies, boundless as are their resources, and bright and glorious as we would fain hope to be their future, they are little better known in the Mother Country than they were fifty years ago, and far less known than portions of Europe wholly unconnected with us, and which it takes twice as long to reach. For one educated Englishman acquainted with Canada or New Brunswick, there are probably twenty who have visited Egypt, and a hundred who are familiar with Rome. Mr. Johnston shall give his own account of his motives and purposes in visiting North America.

'Until I personally visited North America, my own notions as to the agricultural condition, capabilities, and resources of the several new provinces and states were, I now find, notwithstanding all I had heard and read, of the crudest, most general, and indefinite character. The exaggerations of interested natives and settlers, and the repe-

tition of such exaggerations by travellers who knew nothing of agriculture themselves, and, like myself some dozen years ago, could scarcely distinguish bad land from good: these were all the information our journals and yearly literature afforded us. That wheat and Indian corn poured in upon us at times from those regions, we knew; that some portions of the country were rich and fertile, we could not doubt; and the general conclusion in the public mind was, that these new countries were generally fertile, that inferior land was the exception, that large crops were every where reaped, that the fertility of the whole region was inexhaustible, that the supply of wheat it could send us was without bounds, and that if those who tilled the land and raised the corn in these countries were not so skilful as the average of our own farmers, this was only another evidence that nature there was kinder to the tiller of the soil than she is in our own country, and did not demand at his hands either the same amount of knowledge or the same unceasing toil. One of my objects in visiting North America was to remove the mistiness of my own ideas as to the agricultural character and condition of its several great regions, to test the seeming exaggerations, in which, as if by some natural law, the natives and residents of this northern part of the New World are inclined to indulge. I was desirous also of obtaining a clear idea of the relation which American practice bears to English practice; the prospects and success of individual American to those of individual English and Scotch farmers; American past and future surplus wheat to the state and demands of the English market; the life of the settler in these new countries, to the life he would have led had he remained at home. On a few of these points I have arrived at clear and definite notions — not hastily I believe — though some of them may still be incorrect.' (Vol. i. p. 355.)

The immediate cause of Mr. Johnston's voyage to America appears to have been a request on the part of 'the Governor and House of Assembly of New Brunswick, that he would visit that province with the view of drawing up a Report in reference to its agricultural capabilities.' The state of things which led to this application affords such a curious example of the collateral and unforeseen evils resulting from an artificial and 'protective' policy, that we shall place it briefly before our readers, and, as far as we can, in Mr. Johnston's own words. In the year 1848, the Legislature of New Brunswick began to be seriously uneasy concerning the condition and prospects of the colony. Their import and export trade was declining in an alarming ratio; the timber trade, on which they had been accustomed to rely as their main stay, was rapidly falling off; the labourers who had been engaged in it, a restless but energetic race of men like our navigators, were emigrating to other provinces; and as the New Brunswickers had been accustomed actually to import a large portion of the 'bread-stuffs' which

they consumed, it became a matter of deep anxiety how this altered state of things was to be met.

‘If lumber, as a staple export, was to be insufficient to supply the future wants of the colony in the way of paying for the necessary imports of West India produce and of flour, upon what were the colonists to fall back? Were the hitherto undervalued agricultural resources of the colony greater than had been supposed? Could its 18,000,000 of acres really be made to support a population of 210,000 inhabitants, and thus enable them to dispense at least with the large importation of bread stuffs, for which they had hitherto been yearly indebted to the United States, to Prince Edward’s Island, and to Canada? Or were the mines of the country of such value as to make up for the failure both of lumber and of corn, and to enable New Brunswick to keep pace in future progress with the adjoining states and provinces? Such were the ideas and questions which had been passing through men’s minds when I was honoured with a request to visit the colony, and give an opinion upon its agricultural capabilities.’ (Vol. i. p. 39.)

Mr. Johnston’s explanation of the causes which had led to the disastrous state of the colony is very simple and natural. The high protective duty by which our late commercial system encouraged the export of colonial timber, had had the effect of diverting the attention of the settlers from the steady and laborious pursuits of agriculture to an occupation more adventurous and attractive, and *at times*, though by no means altogether, more lucrative. Large gains were frequently made in the lumber trade, though it is questionable whether on the whole the losses were not greater than the gains, and it is certain that it partook much of the nature of a gambling transaction, and, in proportion as it did so, was injurious and demoralising. Still timber was abundant; the labour of felling it and floating it down to the coast was not excessive; the life led by the lumberers in the woods was free and pleasant; and the great prizes obtained in favourable years, secured a preference to it over every other branch of industry.

‘But, like other branches, the lumber trade had always its period of activity and depression. When the demand was brisk and prices good, the trade was pushed eagerly forward; lumberers went into the woods by droves, and timber was shipped to England in quantities which overloaded the market. Prices in consequence fell; those who were obliged to realise were compelled to sacrifice capital as well as profit; and thus mercantile crises and many failures periodically occurred among the colonial merchants of St. John and other lumbering ports. But such an export trade in the large could only be temporary. Land cleared of timber does not soon cover itself again with a new growth of merchantable trees. Every year carried the scene of the woodman’s labours further up the main rivers, and

into more remote creeks and tributaries, adding to the labour of procuring, and to the cost of the logs when brought to the place of shipment. Hence, prices must rise at home or profits decline in the colony, and the trade gradually lessen. All these had already taken place to a certain extent *, when the further increase of home prices was rendered almost impossible by the equalisation of the timber duties . . . In so far as I have myself been able to ascertain the facts of the case, I think, with many patriotic colonists, that the welfare of these North American provinces would on the whole, and in the long run, have been promoted by a less lavish cutting of the noble ship-timber which their woods formerly contained, and which has already become so scarce and dear. *Home bounties have tempted them to cut down and sell at a comparatively low price, what might for many years have afforded a handsome annual revenue*, as well as an inexhaustible supply of material for the once flourishing colonial dockyard. . . . It was the acknowledged evil of the lumber trade, that so long as it was the leading industry of the province of New Brunswick, *it overshadowed and lowered the social condition of every other*. The lumberer, fond as the Indian of the free and untrammelled life of the woods, receiving high wages, living on the finest flour, and enjoying long seasons of holiday, looked down upon the slavish agricultural drudge who toiled the year long on his few acres of land, with little beyond his comfortable maintenance to show as the fruit of his yearly labour. The young and adventurous among the province-born men were tempted into what was considered a higher and more manly, as well as a more remunerative line of life; many of the hardest of the emigrants as they arrived, followed the example; and *thus, not only was the progress of farming discouraged and retarded*, but a belief began to prevail that the colony was unfitted for agricultural pursuits. The occasional large sums of money made by

* 'When, on a former occasion, about fifteen years ago, a proposal to equalise the timber duties was in agitation, it was represented to the home government that so much capital had been invested in the North American provinces, in the saw mills and for other purposes connected with the trade, that very extensive ruin would follow the immediate withdrawal of protection. The measure, therefore, was not passed at the time, but the colonies were warned to prepare themselves, as the duties would certainly be repealed at no distant date . . . But so far from withdrawing their capital in consequence of this notice, fresh capital poured into the trade, new mills were built, speculation and competition advanced to an unprecedented height, and the prices of lumber were reduced in consequence of this competition, and the consequent over-supply of the home market, *much lower than the removal of the duty would have depressed them*. One of the most extensive lumber merchants of the province owned to me that mutual competition had done far more to injure the trade and the traders than the equalisation of the duties had done.' (Vol. ii. p. 211.)

it, induced also vast numbers of the farmers themselves to engage in lumbering—as a lucky hit in a mining country makes many miners—gradually to involve themselves in debts, and to tie up their farms by mortgages to the merchants who furnished the supplies which their life in the woods required. Thus, not only were large numbers of the young men demoralised by their habits in the woods, trained to extravagant habits, and rendered unfit for steady agricultural labour, but very many of the actual owners of farms had become involved in overwhelming pecuniary difficulties, when the crisis in the lumber trade arrived, and stopped all further credit.’ (Vol. i. p. 37.)

In his progress through the country Mr. Johnston met with many houses and clearings deserted in consequence of the ruinous effect of the protection stimulated lumber trade on the regular processes of agriculture. (Vol. i. p. 97.) The instructive lesson taught by these results will amply justify another extract to explain them.

‘A stranger does not readily comprehend how a depression in the lumber trade should seriously affect the interests of the rural population in any other way than in lessening the demand for produce, and in lowering prices. And it was not till I had been long in the country, and had conversed with many persons on the subject, that I was enabled clearly to separate, in my own mind, the evils which this trade had brought upon the rural population from those which were necessarily attendant on the calling of a farmer. In lumbering, a man goes to the woods in winter, cuts down trees, and hauls them to a brook down which, when the spring-freshets come, he can float them to the main river, and then to the saw-mills of the merchant to whom he sells them. If a man does this upon his own farm, or at no great distance from it, and by the aid of his own family only, all he gets for his wood is pure gain—if, in the meantime, he has been living on the produce of his own farm. But if he goes to a distance, and has been obliged to hire labourers, or has done so with the view of enlarging his operations, he must apply to the merchant for an advance of stores adequate to the winter’s consumption. The cost of these stores and the wages of his men are deducted from the value of the wood he has obtained; and if the price be not very low, he may still have a handsome surplus. Such circumstances lure him on till an unfavourable winter comes, and he is not successful in cutting as good lumber, or in as large a quantity as usual, or in hauling it to the floating place; or a very late spring, or very shallow water, prevents him from getting it to market. Then his debt to the merchant for stores and money must stand over for another year, and his farm is mortgaged as security for the payment. Meanwhile this farm has been more or less neglected, and has been every year growing less produce. His wood must be floated in spring, when his crops ought to be put into the ground. He has been absent in winter, when new land might have been cleared. His mind is occupied with other cares: he does not settle to his agricultural pursuits; and they are

therefore badly conducted, even when he is at home to superintend them. And lastly, while living in the woods, both employer and employed live on the most expensive food. They scorn any thing but the fattest pork from the United States, and the finest Genessee flour. The more homely food, which their own farms produce, becomes distasteful to them; and thus expensive and sometimes immoral habits are introduced into their families, which cause more frequent demands upon the merchant, and a consequent yearly increase of the unpaid bills. In such a state of things, the foreclosing of mortgages, the sale of farms, and the emigration of ruined families, must necessarily be of frequent occurrence.

Now, however, that the Mother Country has reverted to a sounder commercial policy, and by so doing has put an end to those evils, which the artificial stimulus given to the lumber trade by our protective system had entailed upon our American provinces, Mr. Johnston is sanguine in his expectations for their future, and speaks favourably, though soberly, of their suitability for emigrants of the right class. While much difference of opinion seems to exist both among old residents and new settlers on minor matters, upon two essential points all were unanimous: — first, that those who were comfortable and well-to do in the Mother Country had better stay there; and secondly, that emigrants of reasonable industry, prudence, and patience, *who confined their attention to farming alone*, never failed to get on. Land partially cleared is to be purchased at prices varying according to the quality of the soil and the collateral advantages of the location,—but alway for sums which sound very moderate to English ears. From 2*l.* to 50*s.* an acre, seems to be the rate usually given for the fee-simple of farms partially cleared and cultivated, including farm buildings. In consequence, however, of the roaming disposition of many of the settlers, eligible farms are often to be purchased on far lower terms. Mr. Johnston mentions one case in which 200 acres, 60 of them cleared, and many cropped, four cows, two oxen, two heifers, fifteen sheep, twenty tons of hay, a house 30 feet by 20, and a barn 30 feet by 40, were offered for 112*l.* sterling. In England the hay alone would, in some years, have fetched nearly the whole sum. The climate appears to be wonderfully healthy, the crops to be decidedly good where the farming is at all decent,—the warmth of the summer fully compensating for the severity of the winter,—prices to be ample, and labour to be well remunerated, but not extravagant. To sum up the whole in two words, it appears to be a *grateful*, but not a *spontaneous* land. ‘Those persons,’ (says Mr. Johnston, vol. i. p. 25.) ‘are greatly deceived who think that less labour, and less patience

‘and perseverance, are necessary to success in the New World, than in our part of the Old. The chief difference is, that there is room enough in the broad lands of America for the full employment of all, and that the diligent man of moderate desires is sure of a competency.’ The same opinion is repeatedly expressed in various forms, and seems to have been shared by nearly every resident with whom our author conversed. The following case may serve as an instructive specimen.

‘With one of these settlers [near the Miramichi in New Brunswick], John McLean, I had an interesting conversation; and as his history may interest some of my readers also, as an example of the way in which steady industry overcomes difficulties and secures comparative prosperity in a new country, I shall state the leading facts I gathered from him. He came over in 1822. He has 250 acres in his farm, of which 150 are cleared; but he has not force to keep all this land in crop. He works it with the aid of three of his sons, two daughters, and three horses — keeps eleven cows, eight or nine young cattle, and a few sheep. He bought the land in a wild state, cleared it all himself without labour, and has raised eleven children.* He has four sons settled on farms, one of whom paid 150*l.* for his farm: two of them worked as carpenters till they had saved money to buy their farms. Neither he nor any of his sons ever lumbered; not one in twenty makes anything by lumbering. Oatmeal porridge and milk twice a day, and oatmeal cakes, are the prevailing diet. Odds and ends, as he called sugar, tea, &c., are obtained by the sale of butter and cheese. Mr. McLean thinks a man would do well here who could come over with 50*l.* in his pocket, and better with 100*l.* But he ought not to have too much, if he is to labour contentedly and prosper. *He himself had only 5*l.* when he settled*, besides three carts and a year’s provisions.’ (Vol. i. p. 110.)

A country, where an industrious man, starting with only 5*l.* after the purchase of 250 acres of wild land, can in twenty-seven years have not only fought his way to a comfortable position, but have maintained eleven children, and settled four as independent proprietors, equally well off with himself, must assuredly be one of great capabilities to those who know how to avail them-

* The families in many of these North American provinces are very large. In Lower Canada, among the French population, they seem to surpass anything we know here. ‘My driver (vol. i. p. 346.) was one of fourteen children, and was himself the father of fourteen, and assured me that from eight to sixteen was the usual number of the farmers’ families. He even named one or two women who had brought their husbands five and twenty, and threatened “le vingtième pour le prêtre.” I expressed my surprise at these large families. “Oui, Monsieur,” said he, “vous avez raison: nous sommes terribles pour les enfans.”’

selves of its advantages. Mr. Johnston gives many valuable statistical details concerning the wages of labour and the produce of the soil in New Brunswick, as compared both with the Old Country, and with other portions of the New; all of which tell strongly in its favour. Thus the produce per acre of different crops appears to be as follows (Vol. ii. p. 193.):—

Produce per Acre in Bushels.

	Great Britain.	New Brunswick.	New York.	Ohio.	Canada, West.
Wheat -	24	18	14	15 $\frac{1}{4}$	13
Barley -	34	27	16	24	17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oats -	37	33	26	34	25
Buckwheat	-	28	14	20	16
Rye -	25	18	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	16	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Indian Corn	-	36 $\frac{1}{2}$	25	41	-
Potatoes -	204	204	90	69	84
Turnips -	420	390	88	-	-

The comparison of prices in the years 1848—9, per imperial quarter, is equally favourable to the farmers of New Brunswick (Vol. ii. p. 196.):—

Price per Quarter in

	New Brunswick.		Canada, West.		Ohio.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
Wheat - - -	48	6	22	5	24	8
Barley - - -	27	3	14	5	11	9
Oats - - -	13	9	8	0	6	5
Rye - - -	22	9	14	5	12	10
Buckwheat - -	24	0	16	0	11	6
Indian Corn -	35	0	25	8	8	7

In answering the question, 'who are the parties that ought to emigrate to these colonies?' Mr. Johnston says:—

'The climate is very healthy, but no person ought to go who is afraid of the severity of a cold winter. Then no one ought to go to any of these new countries who is tolerably comfortable at home, unless he has a large family to provide for, on whose behalf he is willing to encounter the discomforts which necessarily attend a change to new scenes, circumstances, and habits. As to those who may come to this province, the poor man whose ambition is limited to the attainment of a comfortable independence, abundant food and clothing for his family, and provision for them after his death—he

may come. If he has only money enough to carry himself and his family there, he must and ought to be content to work for others for a year or two, till he save enough to go into the woods and select and clear a lot of land for himself. In thus serving he will also learn the ways and localities of the country; and if he be satisfied with reasonable wages*, he will have little difficulty in finding employment. But if he can convey his family to the woods at once, and has still 20*l.* to 50*l.* over, to sustain them during the first year, industry and hard work will do the rest. If a man contrive to land with 100*l.* in his pocket, he should not linger in the towns to spend it, but should speedily select—if he has not already fixed upon—the country in which he is to fix himself;—and going among the older settlers, he will easily find in most places one willing to sell his land and clearing for a sum within the means he possesses. Thus he may at once place his family in a new home without delay, and avoid the hardships and discomforts which attend upon the first planter of a log-hut in the wilderness. Those who can bring 500*l.*, 1000*l.*, or 2000*l.* with them, will take more time to select, and will probably prefer to settle in an older* and more fully cleared district. These parties will also find farms with wider clearings, and better houses and farm-buildings, which they can purchase for various sums suited to their means, in which, by working with their own hands and families, with a little hired labour, they will be able to live in independence, and may hope to place their children, if industrious, in independent circumstances also.' (Vol. ii. p. 200.)†

* 'The wages of labour for farm-servants employed by the year (besides board, lodging, and generally washing) vary from an average of 16*l.* 16*s.* to a maximum of 28*l.* 16*s.*'

† Another settler is mentioned who came out eighteen years ago to New Brunswick, purchased 275 acres of wilderness for 50*l.* After paying this sum, he and his two brothers had only 60*l.* to begin with; at the end of ten years the farm and stock were valued at 1000*l.*, and he bought his brother's out. 'He considers New Brunswick a good poor man's country,—an expression which briefly includes all the main recommendations of North America generally to the inhabitants of Europe.' (Vol. i. p. 118.)

The men who are likely to manage a colonial life with most success are not the finished and skilled labourers whom the English system of division of labour has brought to perfection in any single department, so much as those who can do a number of things tolerably well,—who can turn their hands to any thing, as the phrase is. One of the settlers observed to Mr. Johnston:—'A man must work as hard here as at home, and longer hours. He must build his own house, make his own family's shoes, and do many other things. A useless man need not come here.' (Vol. ii. p. 172.)

'The Nova Scotians have the reputation of being superlatively handy. A farmer will cut lumber on his farm, and convey it with his own horses to the shores of the bay. With or without the aid of a carpenter he will lay down the lines of a ship. He will build

Mr. Johnston does not hold out any encouragement to mere capitalists, whose object is to live on the interest of their money or the rent of their land. Land is here too much within the reach of every man to render it eligible as a mere investment.

While on the subject of emigration, Mr. Johnston mentions two circumstances, which are curious, and deserve much attention. One is, the apparent deterioration of the race of settlers. The sons of emigrants, born in the colonies, are said to be rarely as energetic or successful as their fathers. The British-born succeed better than the natives. They are steadier, more persevering, more industrious. The remark is made by the native residents themselves — Mr. Johnson heard it on several occasions, and admits that his own observation fully confirmed its truth. (Vol. i. pp. 119—125.) The cause yet remains to be discovered. Some imagine that the climate is unfavourable to the development of the hardier and more pertinacious qualities of the Anglo-Saxon race. Mr. Johnston's explanation is different. After stating how universally he had found the fact admitted, he proceeds:—

'This opinion from the mouths of natives is certainly very provoking, since I can sincerely say, after a very long tour in the province, that a finer looking body of yeomanry is not to be seen in any part of the world. The first provincial-born generation shoots up tall and handsome men and women, pleasant to look upon. It may be that the more slender form is less inclined to steady labour, and that, with the bodily figure, the habits and tempers of the industrious settlers change also. Certainly, as a whole, the regularly-settled inhabitants did not appear to work so hard as the same classes do at home. From that fact, however, I did not feel myself justified in concluding, as some do, that the native-born are naturally or absolutely indolent,—my conclusion was, rather, that a living was easier got in the provinces than in the home-islands, and that, therefore, they did not require to work so hard to obtain it as we do at home.' (See also vol. ii. p. 174.)

The author's observations respecting the Irish settlers are particularly valuable, though casually made; inasmuch as they show that he has hit upon the real explanation of the frequent

'it himself, with the help of his sons; he will even do the smith's work with his own hands. He will mortgage his farm to buy the materials, and will rig it himself. He will then load it with fire-wood from his own farm, and himself sail the ship to Boston, and sell cargo or ship, or both; or he will take a freight to the West Indies, if he can get it, and return in due time to pay off his incumbrances,—or to sell his farm if he have been unsuccessful, and begin the world anew.' (Vol. i. p. 31.)

energy and success displayed by many of the emigrants from the sister island on being transplanted to the New World, in comparison with their listlessness and helpless misery at home. And, so far as we are aware, he is the first among our travellers or speculators who have done so. 'Where the Irish settled *singly*, and among a population of different origin and habit*, he generally found them doing well, though rarely so well as either English or Scotch emigrants. Where they settled *en masse*, and formed a colony of their own, this is the picture he draws of them: —

'The settlers, chiefly Roman Catholic Irish, originally from Bandon, in the county of Cork, are for the most part miserably clothed, keeping wretched-looking houses, have much dirt about themselves and their holdings, nasty-looking pigs running about the doors of their dwellings, and their land and fences for the most part in an untidy condition. It is "Ould Ireland" over again transplanted here, little altered from its home appearance and fashions.' (Vol. ii. p. 17.) Of another settlement he says (vol. ii. p. 176.), '*It consists entirely of Cork men, who have not prospered as yet. According to Mr. Pass (an English emigrant), the South Country Irish are the poorest men that come out, do the worst, and are the least contented. At home they depend upon grants and charity when they can get it, more than on their own industry.*' One of these Cork men, a Schoolmaster, complained bitterly; they were all steeped in poverty and debt, yet they were industrious, he averred; and '*therefore he inveighed against the Mother Country for not making railways in the provinces, and sending out money to employ the people.*' The same demand all the world over from this spoiled and unthriftly race. 'The management of the Irish (observes Mr. Johnston) is still a problem, *when unmixed with other population*, in whatever country they are. . . . As at home, they get together in junketting and merry-making, and estimate the happiness of a spree far above the every-day comforts of clean well-furnished houses and plentiful meals. But mingle these same men in twos and threes among a great predominance of a steadier race, and the restraint and influence of new example makes their children steadier men than their fathers, and more reasonable and contented citizens.'

We have here the indication of a most valuable truth, the admission and full appreciation of which seems to us indispensable to the future well-being of the sister island. It is this: — Wherever the Irish peasantry are so situated, either by subordination of position or minority in numbers, *as to take the tone from those above them or around them*, they succeed and advance.

* 'There were many excellent and hard-working Scotch and Irish farmers in the neighbourhood. . . . *These Irish settlers struck me as representing industry personified.*' (Vol. i. p. 64.)

Wherever they are so far dominant, either from numbers, influence, or concentration, as to overpower such foreign elements of amendment as may have settled among them, or where they are isolated and homogeneous, without a strong, large, and prominent admixture of such foreign superiorities, the failings of their race prevail, and they sink into, or remain in, a low social condition. This lies at the root of the incongruity which has been often observed, and from which so many rash and unsound inferences have been drawn; but the explanation of which Mr. Johnston has so well indicated. It is seen that Irish farmers and Irish labourers often succeed in America and in the colonies, especially in the second generation; that they become diligent, frugal, intelligent, and steady workmen; on which superficial reasoners immediately cry out, 'Here is clear proof that the wretched condition of Irishmen at home arises solely from English misgovernment and a hopeless social position, and from no natural disqualifications of character or race!' The real solution of the incongruous phenomenon is this:—At home, the Irishman is alone, dominant, and uncorrected: he is among Irishmen with the same constitutional failings as himself, from whom he can derive only encouragement in all those qualities which most require enlightenment, shaming, and correction. Thus, 'Ireland for the Irish'—the great cry of their demagogues—would, in fact, be fuel to the fire, brandy to the fever, the exclusion of air to the stifled, the shutting out of light to those who sit in darkness. In the colonies, on the other hand, or in the United States, or even in England, the Irishman finds himself at once in a minority; among a people to whom his filth is an abomination; to whom his idle and untidy habits are disgusting; whose activity awakens his emulation, and whose intelligence can direct his exertions. He is essentially an imitative animal, and needs only a predominant amount of good example before him in order to improve. In foreign countries, or in the colonies, he finds this when he goes there. It is well deserving of consideration,—whether we cannot supply it to him in Ireland? Can we not, in addition to the good already effected by the example, instruction, and enforced system of the inspectors under the Land Improvement Act, introduce a large settlement of English and Scotch farmers throughout the country, who will give that better tone, and diffuse among the natives those better habits and modes of proceeding which they so peculiarly need?

A great deal of our author's attention was directed to an investigation of the probable wheat-exporting powers of the

North American continent; and the chapters he has devoted to this question are among the most valuable in his book, and derive peculiar importance from his well known and thorough competence to pronounce an authoritative opinion on the subject. We shall not attempt to give an analysis of these chapters — all who feel interested in the matter should study them with care. We shall content ourselves with extracting his concluding summary. (Vol. ii. p. 335.) -

‘ It is fair and reasonable, therefore, I think, to conclude, until we have better data, that the wheat-exporting capabilities of the United States are not so great as they have by many in Great Britain been hitherto supposed, that they have been over-stated on the spot, and that our wheat growers at home have been unduly alarmed by these distant thunders,—the supposed prelude of an imaginary torrent of American wheat, which was to overwhelm every thing in Great Britain — farming, farmers, and landlords,—in one common ruin. I have said that the wheat-exporting capabilities of North America as a whole, excluding Upper Canada,—in regard to which I would reserve any decided opinion,—are lessening rather than increasing, though it may be ten years or more before the diminution becomes very distinctly sensible. The main reasons for this opinion, as I have already given them in Chap. vii., are, 1st., that the virgin soils are already, to a considerable extent, exhausted of their first freshness*, and that a comparatively expensive culture, likely to make corn more costly, must be adopted, if their productiveness is to be brought back and maintained; 2ndly, that the new settlers live poorly and hardly at first, and as their wheat is the only thing they have to sell, confine themselves for some seasons to potatoes, buck-wheat, and Indian corn, and send the wheat to market; but as they become more easy in their circumstances they retain more of this grain for their own consumption, while they produce it also at a greater cost; and, thirdly, that as the population increases, that of wheat-consuming individuals who do not raise their own food increases also, and thus every year a larger proportion of wheaten food will be required and retained at home. If the population of the United States, exclusive of California, be now 24,000,000, and if it be increasing, as is said, at the rate of a million a year, so as to promise to these States in 1860 a population of 34,000,000, then it is very safe, I think, to say, that in 1860 their wheat-exporting capability

* ‘ When this exhaustion has come, a more costly system of generous husbandry must be introduced if the crops are to be kept up; and in this more generous system my belief is that the British farmers will have the victory.’ One very important consideration is, that as the virgin soils near the lakes and rivers are exhausted, *those who still seek similar soil are obliged to go further inland, and thus the cost of bringing their produce to market is greatly enhanced.*

will have become so small as to give our British farmers very little cause for apprehension.'

He elsewhere repeats the same conviction, in language which is calculated to carry great comfort to the hearts of those home agriculturists who are panic-stricken by the prospect of endless supplies of American flour at a nominal price.

'In their relation to English markets, therefore, and the prospects and profits of the British farmers, my persuasion is, that year by year our Transatlantic cousins will become less and less able—except in extraordinary seasons—to send large supplies of wheat to our Island ports; and that, when the virgin freshness shall have been rubbed off their new (and easily accessible) lands, they will be unable, with their present knowledge and methods, to send wheat to the British market so cheaply as the more skilful farmers of Great Britain and Ireland can do.' (Vol. i. p. 365.)

Mr. Johnston differs agreeably from the ordinary run of travellers in America in his estimate of the relative progress and capabilities of the United States and the British provinces, and of the energy and powers of their respective inhabitants. He considers that the latter are even now 'going ahead,' at least as fast as their republican neighbours; that their natural advantages are even greater; and that it will be their own fault if they do not soon surpass their rivals. The current idea of the vast relative superiority of the Yankees appears to have originated in the different mental habits of the two peoples. While the British are always grumbling, the Americans are always boasting; and travellers seem to have taken both parties at their word. 'In the provinces,' observes Mr. Johnston, 'it struck me as remarkable that, while among their republican neighbours all the geese were swans, the provincials were constantly maintaining their own swans to be geese. Every thing was wrong in the eyes of many I met, and every thing among themselves inferior; although in almost every particular, when a close examination was made, their own superiority was manifest.' Mr. Johnston is clearly of opinion that a splendid future is in store for Canada; that the St. Lawrence is not only destined to be, but is fast becoming, the great channel by which the produce of the Western States of the Union will find its way to Europe. It drains, and is the natural outlet of, all those vast inland seas on the borders of which lie the rising and fertile States of Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and the western counties of New York; and its only available rival is the Erie Canal, which, in spite of all the skill and energy of the Americans, is becoming yearly more and more inadequate to the traffic which

presses upon it from these mighty regions.* It appears, also, that the cost of transport from the lake coast of Ohio to Liverpool is not only speedier by the route of the St. Lawrence, but 10s. a ton cheaper than by the Erie Canal, and in other respects more convenient. The Mississippi, it is true, borders on portions of these States, but it is a route which, for many kinds of produce, is costly and objectionable. Mr. Johnston speaks as follows:—

‘This greater cheapness of transport, and facility of direct communication, without transshipment, will also draw into this eastern channel a large traffic which never sought Lake Erie, but made its long and tedious way down the Ohio and the Mississippi. The wheat and other produce of the valley of the Ohio, which was intended for the European markets, has hitherto for the most part descended these rivers; and after a voyage of some thousands of miles has reached New Orleans, whence it was re-shipped to its European destination. But this long water-carriage, in the hot and humid climate of the regions through which these rivers flow, is found to affect the quality of the wheat, so that it rarely reaches Europe in so good a condition, or realises so high a price, as similar wheat which has been conveyed through the Eastern States to the shores of the Atlantic.’ (Vol. i. p. 377.)

The common charge of sluggishness and inattention to the interests of the colony brought against the authorities, both home and colonial, Mr. Johnston regards as wholly unjust. Great as have been the exertions of the Americans of the United States to improve and extend their internal navigation, they have been exceeded by those of the British. ‘Meanwhile the Canadian authorities, and those of Upper Canada especially, have not been idle. Indeed, I believe they have done more to promote internal water communication than any State of the Union—I may safely say, than any country in Europe—considering the infancy of their country, the extent to which its material resources have been developed, and the actual amount of its revenue and population.’ The Welland Canal (for large ships) has been constructed between Lakes Erie and Ontario, at a cost of nearly a million and a half; the rapids on the river near Montreal have been flanked by about fifty miles of canals, at a cost of a million more; and all this has been done by a colony whose present population is under 1,500,000, and whose revenue even now does not (we believe) reach 500,000℥.†

‘Altogether, on the execution of canals and river improvements

* The recent opening of the Erie Railway may perhaps in some respect modify this conclusion.

† It is given at 300,000℥ in 1832. (Martin’s *British Colonies*.)

necessary to the direct navigation of the St. Lawrence, from the Upper Lakes to the Atlantic, upwards of 3,000,000*l.* currency, or twelve millions of dollars, have been expended by the legislatures of Upper and Lower Canada. This sum is not only large in itself, but it is especially so, when compared with the revenue hitherto at the disposal of the provincial legislature of the Canadas. When we consider also that the whole canal debt of the State of New York is under seventeen millions of dollars, while the Canadas have burdened themselves with a debt of twelve millions, we shall be willing to allow that the amount of energy displayed by the people north of Lake Ontario and of the Thousand Isles, is not less than has been manifested by the State of New York, nor their faith less in the future growth and greatness of their rising country.' (Vol. ii. p. 375.)

We could quote many passages to the same effect, but we prefer to send our readers to the book for themselves. The author complains much of the restless discontent and impatience of the Canadians, and brings many proofs that they are advancing as rapidly as any people can reasonably desire, and that their future prospects of commercial prosperity are bright enough to satisfy the most towering ambition. Already their population is increasing as fast as that of the Union. Lower Canada has doubled its number in twenty-five years; and that this is not owing to emigration alone appears from the fact, that while the average of births is 1 in every 21, the deaths are 1 in 53. In England the births are 1 in 33, and the deaths 1 in 46. Even in commerce our provinces compare not unfavourably with the States. When our author visited New Brunswick, the trade of the province was suffering under great depression; yet even then its imports and exports exceeded those of the three adjoining States of Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire put together (vol. ii. p. 207.); though the population of the latter was 1,200,000, and that of the former only 210,000. On the whole we think it is impossible to rise from the perusal of these careful volumes without a greatly enhanced estimate of the value of our North American provinces, and a well-grounded hope that our children will see the day when they will form a compact empire at least as powerful and as prosperous as any portion of the Union, if political agitation and the distraction and insecurity which flow from it, are not permitted to mar and blight all these encouraging promises.

At the period of Mr. Johnston's visit to our North American provinces, the discontent consequent on failing crops and a depressed trade had led to much discussion on the question of 'annexation to the United States; and although Mr. Johnston is of opinion that even then the majority of the population, if polled, would have been found favourable to the retention of

their connexion with the Mother Country, yet he does not disguise the fact, that the preponderance of aspiring talent in the colony leans towards opposite views. The energetic provincial spirits feel that a wider field would be open to their powers, and higher prizes set within their grasp, by uniting themselves to the great Republic, than by remaining a mere dependency of a distant Mother Country, and wholly shut out from all participation in the great reward of imperial ambition. A Canadian of surpassing ability might well hope to become President of the United States, and to wield all the mighty but short-lived power attached to that office. But no genius, no industry, no eloquence, would raise him to the position of prime minister of Great Britain. Mr. Johnston's observations on this head are just and interesting. Still he is of opinion that the provinces as a whole would lose rather than gain by incorporation with the United States,—and that those who are now loudest in its favour—the Roman Catholics and the old party of the Family Compact—would be among those destined to be most disappointed by the result. The taxation, too, would be far heavier,—some parties declared in the proportion of ten to one. (Vol. ii. p. 160.) The principal cause of the disloyalty and discontent prevalent at the time of which our author speaks, was the decay of the lumber trade; this the colonists hastily, and, as appears, most inconsequentially, ascribed to the alteration of the British timber duties. The following is very instructive:—

'The depression of trade [in New Brunswick] had awakened, as usually happens, the loudest voices of the grumblers; and meetings were being held in which the provincial government and legislature were denounced, organised resistance to the Mother Country recommended, and annexation lauded as the best of boons and the surest remedy for all their sufferings. . . . The speeches of ambitious or disappointed demagogues are by no means an evidence even of their own opinions and belief; and if almost anything can be considered certain in regard to the temporary sufferings of the province, it is that they were not caused by any action either of the provincial or the home governments, or by any evils which annexation to the United States would cure. This is proved by the fact that the adjoining state of Maine, which possesses very much the same natural capabilities and resources of wealth as distinguish New Brunswick, has suffered of late years precisely in a similar way. Thus, in a petition presented to the Legislature of that State, on the 12th June, 1850, it is stated:—"1. That, for some three years past, ship-building and lumbering have been severely depressed;—2. That, "for a series of years we have been compelled to witness the withdrawal of much of our capital into other States; and, instead of

"immigrants, the departure from among us of the most enterprising young men of Maine ;—3. That it is in vain to expect to retain the natural increase of our population, without holding out inducements for labour beyond what are offered by the pursuits of agriculture and lumbering." Were I to sum up in brief all the complaints I heard in New Brunswick, they would not assume so strong a form as in the above words of the people of Maine. And yet, to cure these evils, the men whom I found agitating St. John, professed to believe that annexation to the United States was alone required! Trade would then amend, capital would flow in, emigration would be checked, lumbering would revive, and European emigrants would pour into the new paradise.' (Vol. ii. p. 140.)

Did our limits allow, there are many points of interest in Mr. Johnston's observations on the United States, particularly those relating to taxation, and to the future probable severance of the Union, to which we should wish to have directed the attention of our readers, and to have offered some comments of our own. But we must conclude with strongly recommending the perusal of a book so replete with valuable suggestions and solid information.

ART. III.—1. *Poems by Hartley Coleridge. With a Memoir of his Life.* By his Brother. Edward Moxon: 1851.

2. *Essays and Marginalia.* By HARTLEY COLERIDGE. Edward Moxon: 1851.

MR. DERWENT COLERIDGE has executed, with much success, one of the most difficult of tasks. He has written the biography of a poet in such a manner as to impart a deeper philosophic interest to his verse without detracting from its charm. The fact that as much must be lost as can possibly be gained by a tediously minute acquaintance with the life of an author, had not been overlooked by Mr. Coleridge. He observes, 'It is thought by many that the lives of literary men are sufficiently known from their writings, and that any record of their private history is at least superfluous. Much may be said in support of this opinion. Of poets, more especially, it may be affirmed that the image which they put forth of themselves in their works is a true and adequate representation of the author, whatever it may be of the man: nay, that in many cases it may depict the man more faithfully,—may show more truly what he was, than any memorial of what he did and suffered in his mortal pilgrimage, too often a sad tissue, so it is made to appear, of frailty and sorrow. . . .

‘ If the record were to be supplied, as has been attempted, by the ordinary materials of the biographer, — by a meagre outline of every day facts, filled in by such anecdotes as vulgar curiosity most commonly collects and remembers, it had better remain a blank.’ Much better, we cordially add: but we are happy to be able to say, also, that the record with which we are here presented, is of a very different sort. Vulgar curiosity has not been catered for in it; and a philosophical curiosity will not seek instruction in it without reward. The passages in his brother’s life which Mr. Coleridge has sketched for us, whether such as determined his outward fortunes, or such as to a careless observer might have seemed trifles, are those by which the structure of character is indicated, and its progress is traced. A happy power of selection is among a biographer’s highest, though least obtrusive, gifts. Mr. Coleridge has exercised it with effect, avoiding that vice of modern biographies, prolixity. Had his memoir consisted of two volumes, instead of half a volume, its force would have been lost in detail, and we should have had a far less vivid picture than is here exhibited to us of the subject it commemorates. The narrative abounds in discriminative criticism, and remarks incidentally thrown out, but full of point. Above all, it is written with frankness and simplicity. Cherishing a deserved respect, as well as affection, for his brother’s memory, he has appreciated his character far too well to think that it needs the concealment of infirmities from which the kindest and most abundant natures are not always the most exempt, and the effects of which are impressed, for evil and for good, upon verse which ‘ the world will not willingly let die.’ In making us acquainted with the man, he has contributed the best materials for a large and liberal comprehension of the poet: nor can we more effectually illustrate Hartley Coleridge’s poetry than by first bringing before our readers some features of a life full of interest, though externally but little varied. It is not often that the life and works of an author are presented to us at the same moment, and for the first time. Such may be considered to be the case on the present occasion, since far the larger portion of the poetry has remained till now unpublished; and, in the life prefixed to it, the poetry which follows finds not seldom an emblem as well as an ‘ efficient cause.’

Born at Clevedon, on the 19th of September, 1796, an eight months’ child, Hartley Coleridge was marked from the first by a sensitiveness of temperament no doubt out of proportion to his physical strength. More than one tribute of song greeted him on his arrival into this world. Some of these aspirations

remained unaccomplished, and some were fulfilled too well. In one of the most beautiful of Coleridge's poems, the poet compares his own early culture with that which he desires for his child.

‘I was reared
In the great city, pent mid cloisters dim,
And saw nought lovely but the sky and stars;
But thou, my babe, shalt wander like a breeze,
By lakes and sandy shores, beneath the crags
Of ancient mountains, and beneath the clouds,
Which image in their bulk both lakes and shores
And mountain crags.’

To this prophecy the younger poet alludes in the memorable sonnet prefixed to a small volume of poetry published in 1833. Addressing the ‘Father and Bard revered’ at a far more advanced age than that father had attained when the above lines were written, he says, in allusion to them, —

‘Thy prayer was heard: I “wandered like a breeze.”’

Not less tenderly was the ‘animosus infans,’ addressed in his father’s poem ‘The Nightingale.’

‘That strain again!
Full fain would it delay me! My dear babe,
Who, capable of no articulate sound,
Mimics all things with his imitative lisp,
How he would place his hand, beside his ear,
His little hand, the small fore finger up,
And bid us listen! And I deem it wise
To make him Nature’s playmate.’

With her youthful playmate Nature played long; and he never ceased to find solace both in her songs and sports. Nature did what Nature may: nor is it her fault if her harmonies, whether of the morn or the eventide, whether lyrical or elegiac, have more power to ‘kindle’ than to ‘control,’ and serve rather as wine to the festive, or as an opiate to those in trouble, than as martial music, bracing us for the warfare of life. He had learned, however, to listen to another voice above, and along with, that of Nature; and, for such discernment, he turns also in gratitude to his father. (Vol. i. p. 111.)

In a strain not dissimilar, the same child was addressed at six years old by the Bard of Rydal.

‘O thou, whose fancies from afar are brought,
Who, of thy words dost make a mock apparel,
And fittest to unutterable thought
The breeze-like motion and the self-born carol;

Thou fairy voyager! that dost float:
 In such clear water, that thy boat
 May rather seem
 To brood on air than on an earthly stream.'

After the lapse of many a chequered year these verses retained their applicability, and were forcibly brought back to the memory even of strangers, who chanced to mark the subject of them as he paced irregularly about, with a vague grace, caught in some stream of thought,—with feet that seemed almost unable to keep their hold of the ground, extended arms, a glowing cheek, and an eye still youthful, flashing beneath long white locks that floated on the air. Wordsworth also indulged in prophecy.

'Nature will either end thee quite;
 Or, lengthening out thy season of delight,
 Preserve for thee, by individual right,
 A young lamb's heart among the full-grown flocks.'

Half the promise was granted if the other half was scattered to the winds. The season of delight had past away: but even when the autumnal pastures had become flecked with patches of monitory snow, the 'young lamb's heart' remained.

The philosopher, whose metaphysical principles ended in the most advanced spiritualism, was, at the period of his son's birth, in the materialist stage of his progress: and it was to the enthusiasm with which he then regarded the speculations of David Hartley, that that son owed his name. He acquired, at a very early date, those habits of abstract thought which characterised his boyhood, though apparently the system of the young psychologist tended at least as much in the direction of Berkeley as of Hartley. The following curious anecdote was preserved in a diary kept by Mr. Henry Crabbe Robinson:—
 'Hartley Coleridge, when about five years old, was asked a question about himself being called Hartley. "Which Hartley?" asked the boy. "Why, is there more than one Hartley?" "Yes," he replied; "there's a deal of Hartleys." "How so?" "There's Picture Hartley (Hazlitt had painted a portrait of him) and Shadow Hartley; and there's Echo Hartley, and there's Catch-me-fast Hartley;" at the same time seizing his own arm with the other hand very eagerly,—an action which shows that his mind must have been drawn to reflect on what Kant calls the great and inexplicable mystery, viz. that man should be both his own subject and object, and that these two should be one. At the same early age,' continued Coleridge, 'Hartley used to be in agony of thought,

‘—puzzling himself about the reality of existence. As when ‘some one said to him, “It is not now; but it is to be.” “But,”’ said he, “if it *is* to be, it is.”’ The relation of the potential to the actual, we must grant to be a somewhat hard riddle for a child of five years old.

From the age of about seven, and during a large part of his boyhood, Hartley Coleridge resided with his uncle, Mr. Southey, at Keawick. In 1808 he was placed with his brother at school at Ambleside, under the care of the Rev. Mr. Dawes, to whom Mr. Coleridge pays a just tribute of respect:—‘He was a ‘man of lofty stature, and immense bodily strength, and though ‘sufficiently exact in the discharge of his scholastic duties, yet ‘he evidently attached quite as much importance to the healthful recreations and out-of-door life of his scholars, as to their ‘progress in Greek and Latin. Morbidly shy, he shrank from ‘mixing in society, and in his walks would as soon have met a ‘lion as a lady in his path . . . He had the very soul of honour, ‘and carried with him in every word and gesture the evidence ‘of a manly and cordial nature.’ From the lessons of this hardy northern Hartley Coleridge derived at least as much benefit as from the Greek Grammar composed for him by his father,—a monument of paternal affection and industry, not a little characteristic; beginning as it does with a philosophic disclaimer of philosophy, proceeding to the complexities of gender and case, and ending with a pregnant essay on the connexion between Idolatry and Atheism. It was a literary curiosity, well worthy of preservation, and will remind the reader of Milton’s logico-poetical exercise, which begins with ‘Ens’ and ‘Predicament,’ and concludes with ‘Rivers arise!’

One of the chief advantages which Hartley Coleridge derived from his school-residence was, that it afforded him an opportunity of being much in the society of Mr. Wordsworth. It was at this time also that at his beautiful seat Elleray he became acquainted with Professor Wilson, ‘who continued to the last ‘one of his kindest friends.’ Sir George Beaumont and Mr. Basil Montague were also among his friends. His biographer remarks, ‘It was so, rather than by a regular course of study, ‘that he was educated,—by desultory reading, by the living ‘voice of Coleridge, Southey and Wordsworth, Lloyd, Wilson, ‘and De Quincey; and, again, by homely familiarity with ‘town’s folk and country folk of every degree; lastly, by daily ‘recurring hours of solitude,—by lonely wanderings with ‘the murmur of the Brathay in his ear.’ At a later period of his life he was described as ‘like the Wye, a wanderer ‘through the woods.’ At school he had much liberty. He

never played with the other boys, and probably never fought with them. He was not sufficiently adroit for ordinary sports, and his uncle used to tell him that he had two left hands. In his lessons he was neither stupid nor unusually quick. He had no school friendships; but his companions admired him for his singularity, and loved him for the fascinating skill with which he told them tales. His powers in this respect seem to have equalled those of the Sultana Scheherazade, though his aim was much less practical:—

‘It was not by a series of tales, but by one continuous tale, regularly evolved, and possessing a real unity, that he enchained the attention of his auditors, night after night, as we lay in bed . . . during a space of years, and not unfrequently for hours together. This enormous romance, far exceeding in length, I should suppose, the compositions of Calprenede, Scudery, or Richardson, though delivered without premeditation, had a progressive story, with many turns and complications, with salient points recurring at intervals, with a suspended interest varying in intensity, and occasionally wrought up to a very high pitch, and at length a catastrophe and a conclusion. . . . He spoke without hesitation, in language as vivid as it was flowing. This power of improvisation he lost, or conceived himself to lose, when he began the practice of written composition.’

At a still earlier period, however, his marvellous power of continuous narration had been yet more signally displayed. Few anecdotes illustrative of childhood are so remarkable as that in which his brother records an instance of this habit. For years the child seems to have lived a double life; and the faith which he reposed in the inward world was at least as great as that with which he regarded the outward. No other incident recorded of his early days is so significant a comment on his after life, both in its strength and its weakness:—

‘At a very early period of his childhood, of which he had himself a distinct though visionary remembrance, he imagined himself to foresee a time when, in a field that lay close to the house in which he lived, a small cataract would burst forth, to which he gave the name of Jug-force. The banks of the stream thus created soon became populous, — a region — a realm; and as the vision spread in ever-widening circles, it soon overflowed, as it were, the narrow spot in which it was originally generated; and Jug-forcia, disguised under the less familiar appellation of Ejuxria, became an island continent, with its own attendant isles; a new Australia, or newest Sea-land, if it were not rather a reflection of the old Europe projected from the clouds on some wide ocean somewhere. The history and geography of this region were at one time as familiar to me, to say the least, as any—other portion, I was about to say, of the habitable globe. The details have gradually faded from my memory, and, fitly enough, no written record remains (though an elaborate map

of the country was once in existence), from which they can be recovered.

“The earth hath bubbles as the water hath,
And these are of them.”

‘Taken as a whole, the Ejuxrian world presented a complete analagon to the world of fact, so far as it was known to Hartley, complete in all its parts; furnishing a theatre and scene of action with *dramatis personæ*, and suitable machinery, in which, day after day, for the space of long years, he went on evolving the complicated drama of existence. There were nations, continental and insular, each with its separate history, civil, ecclesiastical, and literary, its forms of religion and government, and specific national character. In Portfomandra, the analagon of England, as I now discern, . . . the tissue was woven with wonderful minuteness, and uniform consistency. The names of generals and statesmen were “familiar to my ear as “household words.” I witnessed the war of faction, and had to trace the course of sedition. I lived to see changes of government, a great progress of public opinion, and a new order of things. When at length a sense of unreality was forced upon him, and he felt himself obliged to account for his knowledge of and connexion with this distant land, he had a story, borrowed from the Arabian Nights, of a great bird by which he was transported to and fro. But he recurred to these explanations with great reluctance, and got rid of them as quickly as possible. Once I asked him how it came that his absence on these occasions was not observed; but he was angry and mortified, and I never repeated the experiment. In truth, I was willingly beguiled. His usual mode of introducing the subject was, “Derwent,” (for these disclosures in latter years were made to me alone) “I have had letters and papers from Ejuxria.” . . . Nothing could exceed the seriousness of his manner, and doubtless, of his feelings. He was, I am persuaded, utterly unconscious of invention. . . . I have reason to believe that he continued the habit mentally, from time to time, after he left school, and, of course, had no longer a confidant.’

In a letter from Mrs. Basil Montague, in whose house he spent some time when a child, his anxieties on the subject of this imaginary race are thus amusingly depicted:—‘One day when he was walking very pensively I asked him what ailed him. He said, “My people are too fond of war; and I have “just made an eloquent speech in the Senate, which has not “made any impression on them, . . . and to war they will go.”’ That such movements of mind, however indicative of genius, are yet unhealthy if indulged habitually, encouraged artificially, or left unbalanced by opposite habits, can hardly be doubted. Except in the highest moments of creative energy, the mind should never lose sight of the distinctness of its own conceptions from the phenomena of the outward world. It is this self-pos-

session — a thing wholly distinct from a morbid self-consciousness — which chiefly separates inspiration from mere enthusiasm. Who can read Shakspeare or Dante, the greatest masters of the world of vision (though the former was stronger yet in a more terrestrial sphere), without perceiving that they ever continue lords over themselves, and that the Spirits whom they summon go and come alike at their command? The keener a poet's intuition of the ideal the more does he require a corresponding urgency in his sense of the real. The knowledge of *what is* and of *what ought to be* are the two opposed wings upon which the poetic mind rises; and the breadth of pinion at each side must be equal if the flight is to be sustained. This is one reason that mere Veracity, as distinguished from philosophical Truth, though it often appears but a condescension to unimportant fact, occupies, notwithstanding, so high a place in the world of Art. The effort to attain it is a perpetual discipline of humility, of attention, of regard for others, and of self-command; and the exercise of it not only stamps upon works of genius that 'note' of *authenticity*, required most by the most unfamiliar themes, but also removes from them the innumerable aberrations or weaknesses which may often be ultimately traced to some moral defect, such as vanity, unsteadiness, or want of a decisive aim. Severity, indeed, is a characteristic of all genuine Art; for while beauty is ever its object, purity is the inseparable condition of its intellectual fruitions. Self-indulgence, therefore, must in all its forms be hostile to the consolidation of the poetic faculty; nor is the Syren more seductive in any other form than that of abstraction which subsides into day-dream, and imagination which feeds ever on its own stores. It is not a predominance of intellect, but a deficiency of will, which banishes us from the world of reality, and converts into a gilded prison the palace-halls of the imagination.

The influence of an education; which, though it included so much of an elevating nature, was yet on the whole one of development, rather than of discipline, was not calculated to supply the deficiencies of a nature rich in resources, but poor in the power of turning them to account; and a childhood and boyhood, 'not only simple, tender-hearted and affectionate, but 'truthful, dutiful, thoughtful, and religious, if not devout,' did not pass into early manhood without tokens of approaching danger. 'A certain infirmity of will, the specific evil of his 'life, had already shown itself. His sensibility was intense, 'and he had not wherewithal to control it. *He could not open a 'letter without trembling.* He shrank from mental pain. He 'was beyond measure impatient of constraint. He was liable

‘to paroxysms of rage, often the disguise of pity, self-accusation, or other painful emotion — anger it could hardly be called — during which he bit his arm or finger violently. He yielded, as it were unconsciously, to slight temptations, slight in themselves, and slight to him, as if swayed by a mechanical impulse apart from his own volition. It looked like an organic defect — a congenital imperfection.’ Apparently he was not himself without forebodings. They are referred to in a letter from Mr. Chauncey Hare Townshend, who became acquainted with Hartley Coleridge during his college life, and mentions many interesting particulars connected with him. On one occasion, during a summer vacation which he passed at Greta Hall, he recited in Mr. Townshend’s presence Wordsworth’s poem, ‘Resolution and Independence,’ in which the poet, illustrating a mood of despondency, says —

‘And fears and fancies thick upon me came;
Dim sadness and blind thoughts, I knew not, nor could name.’

‘Hartley here stopped, and there was a pause of silence, broken by his saying, in somewhat of an altered and lower tone — “I cannot tell you how exactly this and other expressions in this grand poem of Wordsworth’s hit my mood at certain times so exclusively as almost to render me unobservant of its corrective and higher tendencies. ‘The fear that kills, and hope that is unwilling to be fed’ — These I have known; I have even heard a voice, yes, not like a creation of the fancy, but an audible and sensuous voice, foreboding evil to me.”’

His life at Oxford determined the character of his future career. Its miscarriage, as his brother touchingly remarks, ‘deprived him of the residue of his years.’ The difficulties with which his peculiar nature had to contend on that novel field cannot be better illustrated than by an extract from a letter to his brother, when all was over: —

‘With few habits but those of negligence and self-indulgence, with principles honest indeed and charitable, but not ascetic, and *little applied to particulars*, with much vanity and much diffidence, a wish to conquer, neutralised by a fear of offending, with wavering hopes, uncertain spirits, and peculiar manners, I was sent among men, mostly irregular, and in some instances vicious. * Left to myself to form my own course of studies, my own acquaintances, my own habits; to keep my own hours, and in a great measure to be master of my own time, few know how much I went through; how many shocks I received from within and without; how many doubts, temptations, half-formed ill resolutions passed through my mind. I saw human nature in a new point of view, and in some measure learned to judge of mankind by a new standard. I ceased to look for virtues which I no longer hoped to find, and set, perhaps, a disproportionate value

on those which most frequently occurred. The uncertainty of my prospects cast a gloom on what was before me. . . . The complex effect of all this discontent and imprudence was, of course, self-reproach, inconsistency, quickly formed, and quickly broken resolutions, just enough caution to lose my reputation for frankness, increasing dread of my *consocii*, incapability of proceeding in any fixed plan, and an extreme carelessness whenever the painful restraint was removed.'

Notwithstanding the defects here so sternly commented on, Hartley Coleridge's Oxford life was far from being a blank; nor could he say with respect to it, 'I have lost the race I never ran.' He not only acquired great social celebrity from his wit and eloquence, but he read hard, and gained the expected prize. He obtained a fellowship at Oriel with high distinction, his superiority not admitting of a doubt. His brother thus continues the narrative:—

'A proud and happy day was it for me, and for us all, when these tidings reached us. Obviously unfit for the ordinary walks of professional life, he had earned for himself an honourable independence, and had found, as it seemed, a position in which he could exert his peculiar talents to advantage. But a sad reverse was at hand. . . . At the close of his probationary year he was judged to have forfeited his Oriel fellowship, on the ground, mainly, of intemperance. Great efforts were made to reverse the decision. . . . A life singularly blameless in all other respects, dispositions the most amiable, principles and intentions the most upright and honourable, might be pleaded as a counterpoise in the opposite scale. It was to no purpose. The sentence might be considered severe; it could not be said to be unjust; and alas! my poor brother did not take the only course which could have discredited the verdict of his judges. The infirmity which was thus heavily visited was not subsequently overcome.'

The rest of his life may be narrated in few words. He lived in London for about two years after leaving Oxford, and passed his time writing for various magazines, projecting graver works, cultivating friendly relations, and now and then embodying in verse the accidents of the moment. The three exquisite sonnets 'to a Friend,' with which his first volume commences, are a record of the joy with which he at this time met in London Robert Jameson, the early companion of his mountain wanderings. We can but find room for one of them:—

'When we were idlers with the loitering rills,
The need of human love we little noted;
Our love was nature; and the peace which floated
On the white mist, and dwelt among the hills,
To sweet accord subdued our wayward wills;

One soul was ours, one mind, one heart devoted,
 That wisely doating, asked not why it doated,
 And ours the unknown joy that knowing kills.
 But now I find how dear thou wert to me ;
 That man is more than half of nature's treasure,
 Of that fair beauty which no eye can see,
 Of that sweet music which no ear can measure ;—
 And now the streams may sing for others' pleasure,
 The hills sleep on in their eternity.' (Vol. i. p. 5.)

To this period belongs the fragment of 'Prometheus,' left unfinished; and not completed afterwards, in part because the subject had in the mean time been appropriated by Shelley. It displays much beauty of thought and imagery, as well as much metrical facility; but if the subject was not too stern a one for the author, at least it was 'above the years which he then had.' The poem is not conceived with that simplicity and grandeur which the mighty myth required. The former quality, indeed, is wanting even in Shelley's splendid version of it; and whole pages of cloudy or of crude metaphysics perplex a poem which might have been rendered first-rate with little aid but that of a pair of scissors. Shelley, however, possessed all the high energy necessary, considering the model whom he emulated rather than imitated; and his work is sufficient to prove that he had strength to bend the bow of Ulysses, though not skill to send the arrow home to the classic mark. Between such a theme and the gentler genius of Hartley Coleridge, there was perhaps as little congeniality as between the suffering Titan and the chorus of Sylphs whom the northern poet sends to console him. The best part of the poem is the 'Conclusion,' a very noble hymn, in which the liberation of the earth is celebrated.

After leaving London he returned to Ambleside, and undertook the management of the school left vacant by the retirement of his old friend, Mr. Dawes. After four painful years of trial, this mode of life was given up. He had not expected much from it, and writes, 'I had a presentiment that it would never do, and therefore your commendations seemed like reproaches put out to interest. . . . How could I endure to be among unruly boys from seven in the morning till eight or nine at night, to be responsible for actions which I could no more control than I could move a pyramid?' From Ambleside he removed to Grasmere, where, as usual, he 'won all hearts.' His exquisite appreciation of Nature, as well as the habitual poetry with which he extracted a moral meaning from her face and gestures (for to him Nature was a friend; and his days were spent, not in admiration of her only, but in converse with her,)

are denoted by many a passage in his letters, not less poetical than his best poetry. He writes thus in July, 1830: —

'And now the day of rest draws to a close. The weather has kept the Sabbath. The morning was the very perfection of stillness. No gay sunshine, no clamorous wind, no drudging rain; the sky wore one grey sober veil, and the mist hung upon the hills as if it paused on its journey; the vapours were gathered up; no light detachments foraged along the mountain sides, to catch the flying sunbeams; but the thick masses formed an even line, like an army drawn up for a decisive engagement, and only halting till the truce of God was past; they divided the mountains as it were in half, concealing the higher moiety, and leaving the lower bulk distinct in dark, damp, solemn visibility. The vale was clad in deepest green, and fancifully resembled the face of one that is calm and patient after long weeping. The few patches of hay, gathered into round cocks, appeared to solicit the prayers of the congregation. All was quiet, pensive, not sad; only the young damsels in their fresh and fragrant garments (such, I mean, as did not think it necessary to look like death, because a man whom they cared nothing about was gone, let us hope, to heaven) tripping along the fields and green lanes, and picking their way in moist high roads, glanced by like living sunbeams, and made their bright blue and pink ribbons dance like things of life.'

And again: —

'The rain has fallen like a blessing on herb, and tree, and flower. The fields, the hills, the lake, so fickle yet so constant in its commingling transitions from light to shade, were possessed in the unity of peaceful gladness, now rejoicing in the soft yellow sunbeams, now pensive not sad, as the clouds floated leisurely along the sky. The birds who love in their seasons, and know not the collapse of despair, nor the fighting chaos of jealousy, nor the shame, the uneasy silence, the self-condemned yet cherished longing of forbidden hope, sang as if there were no evil on earth.' (Vol. i. p. 170.)

In the year 1832 he removed to Leeds, having contracted an engagement with a young publisher resident there, Mr. Bingley, to furnish materials for a volume of poetry and another of prose. To this arrangement we owe the first series of his poems, and also his *'Worthies of Yorkshire and Lancashire.'* The latter work, consisting of thirteen lives, and filling a large octavo volume of 632 pages, came out originally in numbers, and having been completed in about a year, indicates on the part of its author no small power of continuous application under favourable circumstances. It is written with much vigour and eloquence, abounding in picturesque descriptions of events, as well as a dramatic delineation of character, and is enriched with many acute remarks and original trains of thought. During the course of the next year Mr. Bingley unfortunately became a bankrupt,

and the engagement was broken off. In the year 1834 Hartley lost his father. The following extract from a letter, written on that occasion, shows how keenly he felt the wound, and how deep a seat the affections occupied in his heart:—

‘It was his wish that he might so meet death as to testify the depth and sincerity of his faith in Jesus. And was he not, while life and breath were granted him, a powerful preacher of Jesus? For myself I can speak that he; he only, made me a Christian. What with my irregular passions, and my intellect—powerful perhaps in parts, but ever like “a crazy old church clock with its bewildered chimes”—what, but for him, I might have been I tremble to think. But I never forgot him. No, Derwent, I have forgot myself too often, but I never forgot my father. And now if his beatified spirit be permitted to peruse the day-book of the recording angel, to contemplate the memory of God which forgets nothing, in which the very abortions of time, the thoughts which we think we never thought, the meanings which we never meant to mean, live everlastingly; if he may look in that book, or rather, if an intimate knowledge of its contents be consubstantiated with the essence of his beatitude, then will he know that among my many sins it was not one that I loved him not; and wherever the final bolt of judgment may drive me, it will not be into the frozen regions of sons that loved not their fathers.’ (Vol. i. p. 111.)

That reverential, and even remorseful, tenderness of affection which constituted so important an element in Hartley Coleridge’s character is beautifully revealed in the following sonnet also:—

‘Oh! my dear mother, art thou still awake?
Or art thou sleeping on thy Maker’s arm,—
Waiting in slumber for the shrill alarm
Ordnained to give the world its final shake?
Art thou with “interlunar night” opaque
Clad like a worm while waiting for its wings;
Or doth the shadow of departed things
Dwell on thy soul as on a breezeless lake?
Oh! would that I could see thee in thy heaven
For one brief hour, and know I was forgiven
For all the pain, and doubt, and rankling shame
Which I have caused to make thee weep or sigh.
Bootless the wish! for where thou art on high,
Sin casts no shadow, sorrow hath no name.’ (1845.)

The latter years of his life glided away almost without incident. They were spent in the ‘Nab Cottage,’ on the banks of Rydal Water; the lake, with its two woody islands, lying before his windows, at a stone’s throw from the door. In this humble abode he mused, meditated, studied, filled with marginal anno-

tations many volumes of old divinity and philosophy, as well as many of a lighter sort, recorded his thoughts in countless note-books, and widened every day the foundations of a structure never, alas! to be raised, or never at least to be presented to mortal eye. The end came suddenly, as night in a tropical region. His health had usually been strong: but a sudden fit of bronchitis was sufficient to 'slit the thin-spun life.' On the 26th of December, 1848, his brother was summoned to his bed-side; on the 6th of January, 1849, he was taken to his rest. He suffered with the utmost humility, devotion, and patience; passed his time in religious exercises; and received the Holy Communion in the society of a friend, 'whose participation he desired on this occasion,' associating, as was his wont, human and divine love. He was lamented by young and old; for his removal was felt to be a deprivation not easily to be replaced by those many 'friends to whom his visits, his conversations, his playful wit, his simple and affectionate confidingness,—nay, his very foibles and eccentricities, his need of guidance and protection,—had become a refreshment and a stimulus,' and among whom, 'not merely the kindly affections were drawn out in a peculiar manner, but a love of goodness, purity, and truth was fostered by his society.'

Among the many who mourned for him was one whose heart was heavy with a nearer loss. The aged friend who forty-five years before had predicted the future fortunes of the fairy child, survived to look upon his grave.

'The day following he walked over with me to Grasmere, to the churchyard, a plain enclosure of the olden time, surrounding the old village church, in which lay the remains of his wife's sister, his nephew, and his beloved daughter. Here, having desired the sexton to measure out the ground for his own and for Mrs. Wordsworth's grave, he bade him measure out the space for a third grave for my brother. "When I lifted up my eyes from my daughter's grave," he exclaimed, "he was standing there." . . . Then turning to the sexton, he said, "Keep the ground for us, we are old people, and it cannot be for long." . . . In little more than a twelve month his venerable and venerated friend was brought to occupy his own grave.' (Vol. i. p. 186.)

The fates that attended Hartley Coleridge through life ruled also at his death. He had ever been the sport of Fortune; but Fortune seemed ever repenting her hardness to him. Whenever he tripped it was among friends, not 'among thieves,' that he fell. As often as he went astray, the 'spirit in his feet' led him into some kindly place of refuge. The error 'of his way' left comparatively little stain upon a spirit which

repelled evil as the feathers of a bird shake off rain. The less care he took of himself the more care was taken of him by those, who had humility enough to suspect that their own failings were not less grievous because they were of a nature less likely to bring their punishment with them, and perhaps more likely to cherish self-love and add to worldly wealth. If his foibles cheated his genius of half its reward, his meekness made him feel that 'Best are they paid whose earthly wage is nought.' His death, like his life, was an evil conquered by good. Falling upon him as it were accidentally, it seems not more suddenly to have brought to nought his intellectual designs than it brought to bear the fruits of the spirit. It was also attended by the external consolations, which neither high station nor intellectual prosperity can command. Among the anecdotes of statesmen few are more interesting than that which records the death of Pitt. The hand, which had so long sustained the sceptre of his country, found no hand to clasp it in death. By friends and by servants he was alike deserted; and a stranger wandering on from room to room of a deserted house, came at last by chance to a chamber, untended but not unquiet, in which the great minister lay, alone and dead. It was otherwise with the 'luckless,' but well-loved, man of genius. For miles round in the valleys, as he lay dying, there was not one who had not time to think of him. Four physicians sat round a poor man's bed; and strangers contended with kinsfolk for the privilege of nursing him.

The reference to Hartley Coleridge's life which we have made above constitutes in itself the best comment on his works. We shall endeavour to follow it up by extracts from his poems, which, if not always selected from the best among them, are yet calculated to illustrate the compass and variety of his powers. His poetry had very different characteristics at different periods of its author's life. In the earlier poems the imagination holds, relatively, at least, if not absolutely, the larger place; and combines with a pervading sense of beauty to build up an intellectual and ideal sphere analogous to the visionary world in which so much of the Poet's childhood was passed. In that fine region thoughts, sometimes of great loveliness, and as often marked by a lucid brilliancy, float about, self-supported, like birds of Paradise, and seem to find a natural element. The following sonnet may serve as a specimen of the class.

'What was't awakened first the untried ear
Of that sole man who was all human kind?
Was it the glad, me welcome of the wind,
Stirring the leaves that never yet were sere?

The four mellifluous streams which flow'd so near,
 Their lulling murmurs all in one combined?
 The note of bird unnamed? The startled hind
 Bursting the brake in wonder, not in fear,
 Of her new lord? Or did the holy ground
 Send forth mysterious melody to greet
 The gracious pressure of immaculate feet?
 Did viewless seraphs rustle all around,
 Making sweet music out of air as sweet?
 Or his own voice awake him with its sound?

(Vol. i. p. 9.)

The following illustrates a graver mood:—

'If I have sinned in act, I may repent:
 If I have erred in thought, I may disclaim
 My silent error, and yet feel no shame;
 But if my soul, big with an ill intent,
 Guilty in will, by fate be innocent,
 Or being bad, yet murmurs at the curse
 And incapacity of being worse,
 That makes my hungry passion still keep Lent
 In keen expectance of a Carnival;
 Where in all worlds that round the sun revolve
 And shed their influence on this passive ball,
 Abides a power that can my soul absolve?
 Could any sin survive, and be forgiven—
 One sinful wish would make a hell of heaven.'

(Vol. i. p. 31.)

Hartley Coleridge's sonnets possess a charm almost peculiar to themselves, even in an age which has abounded in that form of composition. Perhaps no species of short poem admits of so much variety in its degrees of merit. Many of our most popular poets, such as Byron, Shelley, and Southey, have attempted it with little success. In a weak or unskilful hand it becomes at once the most relaxed and the most constrained species of poetry, a single trivial thought being miserably stretched out and nailed down over a gaping framework of fourteen lines. Nor does a merely artificial condensation mend the matter. It is not difficult to force a number of thoughts into a narrow compass; but if these thoughts chance to be heterogeneous, and if their connexion be arbitrary, they will not stand on better terms by reason of the forced proximity. It is not the 'multa,' but the 'multum' of thought that constitutes the intellectual worth of a sonnet. Many of the best sonnets of Milton and Wordsworth contain little more than the expression of a single thought; but that thought is one in which a profound principle is seminally involved; so that in its simple

enunciation is to be found the core of a moral essay, the heart of a philosophical treatise. Such a thought can never belong exclusively to the logical department of the intellect. Proceeding from the soul, and not from the mind only, it necessarily involves moral sentiment also; and the imaginative embodiment in which it expresses itself is no artificial adornment, but is a clothing consubstantial with its essence. The unity which characterises a good sonnet imparts to it a majesty and might which even the noblest thoughts cannot possess if allowed, as in philosophical poetry they generally are, to run into a series, and thus to become merged in each other, as parts subordinated to a whole. A true sonnet is a complete whole. It hangs self-balanced on its centre, and, for a thoughtful reader, turns forth perpetually a new face to the light of truth. It issues from the contemplative even more than from the meditative order of mind, implying a power among the rarest and most arduous — that of resting upon a single idea, and viewing it in all its aspects, rather than that of using it as a stepping-stone to other ideas. It requires not less a ‘shaping’ mind, needing, as it does, in the highest degree, that *form*, without which poetic thought has neither consistence nor permanence; and it is no doubt the more seldom successfully produced, because the contemplative faculty and the shaping art but seldom exist together. There are, however, two very different species of sonnet. The philosophical, of which we have been speaking, dates chiefly from Milton, and, in the main, belongs to our northern region. The South had long before produced a form of the sonnet less grave, authoritative, and dogmatic, but exquisite from the equipoise of tender sentiment with a graceful imagination, and from a diction refined at once and concise. Examples of both sorts may be found in the volumes before us; but to the latter, perhaps, the most perfect belong. Many of them possess a certain indescribable sweetness (a quality wholly distinct from softness), which reminds us more of the Elizabethan poetry than of those modern writers whose attempts at tenderness result commonly but in effeminacy. In this respect they resemble the best among old Daniel’s Sonnets, but Shakspeare’s yet more, from their union of pathos with imaginative subtlety. Like Shakspeare’s, too, they are at once steeped in personal interest, and free from all offensive egotism. To write of oneself does not necessarily imply egotism. There is nothing in which man differs more from man than in the mode of handling that dangerous subject. There are poets whose writings indicate rather a human than an individual interest in themselves, as though self had been but the specimen in which

they had found imaged the psychological history of their kind. In the works of others, and especially in the volumes now before us, self is presented in touches so delicate and forbearing, and in union with such a generous regard for others, as well as for abstract things, that self-pity seems but the sadness of one who can look down on himself with the same feelings which he would bestow on 'a horse over-driven,' or a wounded bird.

To the same department of his verse we may perhaps refer the following poem, in which aspiration is finely mingled with tenderness. It illustrates at once the spontaneous movement, and the artistic grace of his earlier poems; and the stanza, which we have not met with elsewhere, may be called a sort of lyrical sonnet, flowing forward with a 'swan-like grace,' and yet ever winding back into itself:—

'She was a queen of noble nature's crowning:
A smile of hers was like an act of grace;
She had no winsome looks, no pretty frowning,
Like daily beauties of the vulgar race:
But if she smiled, a light was on her face,
A clear cool kindliness, a lunar beam
Of peaceful radiance, silvering o'er the stream
Of human thought with unabiding glory;
Not quite a waking truth, not quite a dream,
A visitation bright and transitory.

'But she is changed,—hath felt the touch of sorrow;
No love hath she, no understanding friend;
Oh, grief! when heaven is forced of earth to borrow
What the poor niggard earth has not to lend:
But when the stalk is snapped, the rose must bend.
The tallest flower that skyward rears its head,
Grows from the common ground, and there must shed
Its delicate petals. Cruel fate, too surely;
That they should find so base a bridal bed,
Who lived in virgin pride, so sweetly and purely.

'She had a brother, and a tender father,
And she was loved, but not as others are
From whom we ask return of love,—but rather
As one might love a dream; a phantom fair
Of something exquisitely strange and rare,
Which all were glad to look on, men and maids,
Yet no one claim'd—as oft in dewy glades
The peering primrose, like a sudden gladness,
Gleams on the soul—yet unregarded, fades—
The joy is ours, but all its own the sadness.

'Tis vain to say her worst of grief is only
The common lot, which all the world have known:
To her 'tis more, because her heart is lonely,

And yet she hath no strength to stand alone.
 Once she had playmates, fancies of her own ;
 And she did love them. They are past away
 As fairies vanish at the break of day—
 And like a spectre of an age departed,
 Or unsphered Angel woefully astray—
 She glides along—the solitary hearted.’

(Vol. i. p. 44.)

A rich vein of fancy is among the characteristics of Hartley Coleridge's earlier poems. We may name the lines ‘to the *Nautilus*,’ and an ‘Address to certain Gold Fishes,’ as specimens. ‘Leonard and Susan’ belongs to that order of poetry of which the materials are supplied by reflection and human life. To this section—a very different one from that less substantial class in which his early poems may commonly be included—we should refer such pieces as the ‘Sabbath Day's Child,’ ‘To my Unknown Sister-in-law,’ ‘New Year's Day,’ ‘Why is there War on Earth,’ and the beautiful lines ‘On the Death of Henry Nelson Coleridge,’ with which, if our space permitted, we should adorn our pages. This is the section of the author's works which embodied his largest experience, and impregnated it with what was deepest and strongest in his individual character. His poetry has no higher merit than that of being true-hearted, and that is the truest portion of it which speaks to us most of the writer.

The same remark might be applied to most poets. Out of the heart we are told proceed the issues of life; and assuredly the personal being is not less the source, though often a secret source, by which the ‘life poetic’ is fed. Great thoughts, indeed the greatest, come from it. Literary and scientific works for the most part are produced by certain isolated faculties, working with a definite and restricted aim. Poetry, on the other hand, if it be genuine, flows from the whole being, not from a part of it, and makes report therefore of all that is deepest in the poet. The privilege of fiction permits him to speak the truth. His sympathies with others teach him to know himself; and, with the understanding that nothing which he says is to be interpreted literally, he ‘whispers the secret among the reeds.’ Even the poets who have prided themselves most on their imaginative superiority to the world of experience and realised feeling, and who have practised poetry most exclusively as an art, have not been able to maintain their boasted reserve; and in as many of their poems as have secured a place in the heart of others authentic traces are to be found of their own. In poetry a ‘general confession’ is made,—a confession not of facts, but of moods, of hopes and

fears, of desires and recollections, and of aspirations which but went the further forward because the shaft missed the mark at which it was aimed. The public, indeed, would be but a rude confessor; but for the mere public little of real poetry has ever been written. A book has been well described as 'a letter 'to one's unknown friends.' The expression applies especially to a volume of poetry. True poetry is not an appeal to public admiration, but a voice from a lonely heart, issuing forth in the hope of wakening an echo in answering hearts, be they few or many. Fame, indeed, is also notoriously among the stimulants of poetic exertion; but then 'Fame is Love disguised:'—its appeal is to Posterity, whose award is made when praise is a flattery no more. That award, likewise, is the sentence of unimpassioned justice; and as such it is, perhaps, chiefly desired because it sanctions the sympathy already accorded by congenial minds, and stamps the seal of authenticity and sanity upon thoughts and feelings, dearer to the poet than any applause, but in which, if unconfirmed, he can himself hardly place an unwavering faith.

It is, we think, this personal interest which constitutes the chief charm of Hartley Coleridge's poems. Rich in imagination and intellect, their highest attraction yet lies in the genial temperament and kindly disposition which belong to them. Friendliness and goodwill look forth from them upon all things. We have already seen that, if his childhood was a dream, yet in his later life he was surrounded by all the social relations, and that he appreciated them. At every 'Statesman's' hearth he was a welcome guest. He watched their labours, enjoyed their sports, took his place at the wedding feast or the funeral, and pondered the dispensation of human life, in high or low degree, with a learned eye and understanding heart. And, as he felt he wrote; poetry was not with him an accomplishment cultivated in the spirit of a man of letters. Neither was it an ethical art embodying the speculations of an abstract intelligence. His Muse never lifted either the trumpet of the moral Prophet, or the lyre of the rapt and mystic Bard. She neither sent him with a commission of rebuke and exhortation, nor secluded him from the strife of tongues. She interpreted between him and his neighbours; she freshened and brightened the daily face of Nature; she sweetened the draught of an impoverished life, and made atonement to a defrauded heart. Hence the large proportion of his deepest poems, which were occasioned by domestic events, or the annals of the neighbourhood,—the elegiac verses on old or recent friends; the meditative strains connected with favourite haunts; the birthday and the bridal songs; the stanzas in which familiar incidents are moralised;

and the many finished poems addressed to children, whom he regarded with a peculiar affection, and who apparently were ever prompt to repay it with an especial familiarity. A chance occasion was but the means of letting loose a current of slowly accumulated sentiment. Witness the lines

ON AN INFANT'S HAND.

What is an infant but a germ,
Prophetic of a distant term?
Whose present claim of love consists
In that great power that Nature twists
With the fine thread of imbecility,
Motion of infinite tranquillity,
Joy that is not for this or that,
Nor like the restless joy of gnat,
Or insect in the beam so rife,
Whose day of pleasure is its life;
But joy that, by its quiet being,
Is witness of a law foreseeing
All joy and sorrow that may hap
To the wee sleeper in the mother's lap.
Such joy, I ween, is ever creeping
On every nerve of baby sleeping;
But, baby waking, longest lingers
In tiny hand and tiny fingers,
Like lamp beside sepulchral urn,
Much teaching that it ne'er did learn,
Revealing by felicity,
Foretelling by simplicity,
And preaching by its sudden cries,
Alone with God the baby lies.
How hard it holds!—how tight the clasp!
Ah! how intense the infant grasp!
Electric from the ruling brains
The will descends, and stirs, and strains,
That wondrous instrument, the hand,
By which we learn to understand;—
How fair, how small, how white and pure
Its own most perfect miniature.
The baby hand that is so wee,
And yet is all that is to be;
Unweeting what it has to do,
Yet to its destined purpose true.
The fingers fair, of varied length,
That join or vie their little strength;
The pigmy thumb, the onyx nail,
The violet vein so blue and pale;
The branchy lines where Gipsy eld
Had all the course of life beheld:

All, to its little finger's tip,
 Of Nature's choicest workmanship.
 Their task, their fate, we hardly guess, —
 But oh! may it be happiness!
 Not always leisure, always play,
 But worky-day and holy-day;
 With holy Sabbath interspersed,
 And not the busiest day the worst.
 Not doom'd, with needle or with pen,
 To drudge for o'er-exacting men,
 Nor any way to toil for lucre
 At frown of he or she rebuker;
 But still affectionate and free
 Their never weary housewifery.
 Blest lot be thine, my nestling dove,
 Never to work except in love;
 And God protect thy little hand
 From task imposed by unbelov'd command!

(Vol. ii. p. 128.)

The next poem which we shall extract, is in a very different vein; and if it, too, may in one sense be called 'occasional,' assuredly it is among the noblest of the class. In it one of those men, seldom granted to any age, and whom our own could ill afford to lose, receives a commemoration such as can be given to him neither by the sculptor's nor the painter's art. That a character like that of Dr. Arnold, one which, though abounding in the kindly affections, was yet especially marked by its massive simplicity, its masculine energy, and its ever militant sense of duty, should have attracted the reverence of a man so different, will be a matter of surprise to many. It was not, however, only in their love of wild flowers and hatred of oppression and fraud, that they found a common ground. They shared the same great Christian convictions, and built on them their hopes for the human race. The same Faith which ministered strength to the athlete cast upon the storms of active life, sustained the drooping spirits of the recluse. Hartley Coleridge's nature was also one which, alike from generosity of heart and versatility of mind, had a large power of appreciating the most opposite gifts. We have little doubt that he cordially admired many, who, in him, would have remarked little except his defects.

ON THE LATE DR. ARNOLD.

' Spirit of the Dead!

Though the pure faith of Him that was on earth,
 Thy subject and thy Lord, forbids a prayer —
 Forbids me to invoke thee, as of yore

Weak souls, that dared not meet their God alone,
 Sought countenance and kind companionship
 Of some particular saint, whose knees had grazed
 The very rock on which they knelt; whose blood
 Had made or sanctified the gushing well
 Round which their fond, mistaken piety;
 Had build a quaint confine of sculptured stone; —
 Yet may I hope that wheresoe'er he is —
 Beneath the altar, by the great white throne,
 In Abraham's bosom, or amid the deep
 Of Godhead, blended with eternal light,
 One ray may reach him from the humble heart
 That thanks our God for all that he has been.
 What he is now we know not: he will be
 A beautiful likeness of the God that gave
 Him work to do, which he did do so well.
 Whom Jesus loves to them he gives the grace
 For Him to do and suffer *in* the world;
 To suffer *for* the world was His alone.
 But he in whom we joy'd — for whom we mourn —
 Did he not suffer? Worldly men say, No!
 Of ills which they call ill he had not many;
 The poverty which makes the very poor
 Begrudge a morsel to their very child,
 Was never his; nor did he "pine in thought,"
 Seeing the lady of his love possessed
 By a much richer, and no better man.
 To him the lady of his love was wed,
 Soon as his manhood authorised a wife;
 And though the mother of his many babes,
 To him she still was young, and fair, and fresh,
 As when the golden ring slipp'd from his hand
 Upon her virgin finger.

Yet he suffer'd
 Such pains and throes as only good men feel;
 For he assumed the task to rear the boy,
 The bold, proud boy, into a Christian man.
 'Twas not with childhood that he had to do;
 Its wayward moods, and ready penitence,
 That still is prompt to kiss, if not the rod,
 At least the hand that wields it; not to watch
 Sweet instinct reaching after distant reason,
 And mere affection train'd to duteous love,
 (Though such the solace of his happy home,
 Else how had he the hard behest endured?)
 Nor was it all — oh, bliss! if it had been —
 To teach the young capacious intellect
 How beauteous Greece, — and Rome, the child foredoom'd
 To catch the sceptre from its parent, — spake,
 Fitting high thoughts with words, and words with deeds.

'Twas his to struggle with that perilous age
Which claims for manhood's vice the privilege
Of boyhood; — when young Dionysus seems
All glorious as he burst upon the East
A jocund and a welcome conqueror;
And Aphrodite, sweet as from the sea
She rose and floated in her pearly shell,
A laughing girl; — when lawless will erects
Honour's gay temple on the mount of God,
And meek obedience bears the coward's brand;
While Satan, in celestial panoply,
With Sin, his lady, smiling by his side,
Defies all heaven to arms! 'Twas his to teach,
Day after day, from pulpit and from desk,
That the most childish sin which man can do
Is yet a sin which Jesus never did
When Jesus was a child, and yet a sin
For which, in lowly pain, He lived and died:
That for the bravest sin that e'er was praised
The King Eternal wore the crown of thorns.
In him was Jesus crucified again;
For every sin which he could not prevent
Stuck in him like a nail. His heart bled for it
As it had been a foul sin of his own.
Heavy his cross, and stoutly did he bear it
Even to the foot of holy Calvary;
And if at last he sunk beneath the weight,
There were not wanting souls whom he had taught
The way to Paradise, that, in white robes,
Throng'd to the gate to hail their shepherd home!

The religious spirit which animates the lines we have extracted, is one of the chief elements in Hartley Coleridge's poetry. It is not obtrusively put forward, — never, indeed, polemically; and it seems to find expression only because it could not have been excluded. It is this circumstance which gives its peculiar value to the witness he has unconsciously borne. It was because he wrote as a Humanist that he so frequently, though unintentionally, retraces the lineaments of that Divine image after which Humanity was formed. That philosophy, or rather that retrocession from philosophy, which regards man but as the first of animals, is not confined to professed books of metaphysics. However latently it may exist, it is, in fact (a circumstance far too little reflected on) the informing principle of every work in literature or art, not elevated by the opposite principle. 'Only not all are materialists,' asserts a great philosopher. 'We will not dispute that 'only not all' tend that way, and in their lower moods, or the lower part of their nature,

reach that end; but no one, we think, to whom Humanity is not as much a sealed book as Divinity,—no one who does not rest contented in a merely sensuous estimate of social relations and responsibilities, can be said to be a materialist, however his speculative opinions may err in that direction. In Hartley Coleridge's poetry, the whole scheme of human life is based upon a spiritual foundation; and every natural affection shines forth, relieved against a background of religious reverence. In it the future world supplies the clue to the labyrinth of the present, and strikes the key-note to all the harmonies of a lower sphere. The region in which his spirit moves, if bedewed abundantly with 'Nature's tears,' and haunted by the sighs of mournful retrospection, is yet ever sweetened by a genial atmosphere of faith and love. Amid many vicissitudes, that faith never failed,—lifting up its head through storm and shower, like the 'frail birth of warmth and light,' the autumnal anemone, ever shaken, but never deflowered, to which he compares it. (Vol. ii. p. 90.) That faith preserved from corruption his whole poetic world. To it he owed that moral orthodoxy which banished from his poetry the spirit of waywardness, and imparted to his estimate of life a uniformly healthy tone.

It is not sufficiently observed how much the excellence of the best poetry is a moral excellence. 'The beautiful is good; the good is true,' Hartley Coleridge tells us, and his poetry illustrates the canon: yet few perhaps have recognised the full degree in which Goodness is, in every Art, the soul of beauty and the seal of truth. For imagination, passion, and thought, no moral substitutes, indeed, can be found; but the degree in which these gifts discharge their special functions depends mainly upon their exercise being directed by a prevailing spirit of moral wisdom. The faculties which inspire poetry need themselves to be inspired by that 'higher mind' whose seat is in a wise and generous heart. Without such aid poetry may indeed snatch a temporary charm from Circe; but Nature, our common mother, frowns upon her delusions. The prophet does not differ more from the sorcerer than poetry founded on Nature's goodness and truth is raised above the very highest which has no deeper sanction than that of arbitrary thought and eccentric self-will. No poet is strong enough to stand by himself. It is not what he says, but what Nature says through him, which can endure; not his own thoughts, but the thoughts and experience of universal man, cast in the mould of an all-embracing and sincere imagination. With little of truth or wisdom a poet may indeed delight his own age, or a clique in it; since with its errors his own will so far correspond that he will be in some

sort the expositor and interpreter of them: but his power is transient; for while truth is ever one, error is ever changing; and with later generations his peculiarities will be out of date.

That the poets whose works have become universal — that Homer and Shakspeare were wise and human-hearted men, — nay, that in mind and moral sense, if not in habitual conduct also, they were good men, we all feel to be true, though we cannot prove the fact. It is worth noticing, however, how many of a less exalted order have owed their estimation in a large measure to what may be called the moral sense of their poetry. What would Chaucer have been without that cordiality which imparts a frank kindliness to the ruder, and even to the coarser touches of his caustic humour? What would Spenser have been without that chivalrous ideal, both older and younger than the knight-errantry which furnished matter for his song, and that purity which cast no fabled light upon his fairy bowers? To descend lower, what would have been Cowper's rank in literature if his verse had not been as sane as its author was sometimes 'distracted in mind;' or that of Burns, if his appreciation of courage, patriotism, domestic virtue, and humble worth, had not exceeded tenfold the sensual and lawless elements in his poetry? It would be equally easy to point out recent poets whose reception with future times will not be in proportion to their estimation in that age which they flattered by kindred weaknesses or partaken errors, even while they denounced its institutions and warred on its conventions. As easy would it be to show how far the difference between what they did and what they might have done, is attributable to a waywardness which preferred originality in error before a truth held in common with the many, to a vanity which turned away from the universal heritage in order to make idols of special acquisitions or individual gifts, and to an egotism which interposed the image of self between the poet and the face of earth and heaven. Nor would it be difficult to point out other poets of the same era, belonging to the catholic, not the sectarian, schools of poetry, who with very various degrees of power, have yet used it aright, and reaped their reward: poets who would scarcely have been good writers if they had not been good men, but who understood the greatness of their vocation, and preserved such a loyal reverence for truth and virtue, that they maintained, at least, the balance of the soul, and suffered not their infirmities to suppress their aspirations, to ascend into the region of their moral mind, and to usurp their functions of poetic power. The result is, that their works contain more than their authors consciously put into them; and

that for no small period they will delight and elevate their readers, because, however contracted may be the mirrors which they hold up to Nature and to Man, they are capable of casting at least an undistorted reflection.

But to return. Descriptive power is eminently among the merits of the poems before us. In illustration, we may point the reader's attention to the sonnets beginning 'The mellow year is hastening to its close,' 'New Year's Day,' 'May, 1832,' 'Summer Rain' and many more. Still more remarkably do they exhibit the faculty for critical disquisition. Criticism, indeed, is seldom looked for in poetry; nor has the attempt often proved successful, from the time of Pope's Essay on Criticism to our own days. It belongs to the class of didactic poetry; and assuredly although to instruct as well as to delight is the indirect office, if not the immediate aim, of every art, the method by which poetry teaches is far removed from the scientific. A long didactic poem in general demonstrates itself very soon to be but prose; yet if the experiment be not extended too far, there is no reason why criticism in verse should not be as sagacious as it may be made poignant and pithy. Hartley Coleridge's union of exact thought with a brilliant wit, qualified him admirably for the task; and many a critical essay may be found condensed in his 'Sketches of English Poets.' They consist of lines written in blank leaves of his copy of 'Anderson's British Poets.' Unfortunately the volume containing his sketch of Pope has been lost; and still more unluckily, not a few of those which remain are comments on certain magnates of their day, with whom this day will have no concern, though a poetical Aristotle were to illustrate them. Among the most felicitous of these descriptions are the sketches of Chaucer, Shakspeare, Daniel, Dryden, and Donne. The last may serve as a specimen:—

'Brief was the reign of pure poetic truth.
A race of thinkers next, with rhymes uncouth,
And fancies fashion'd in laborious brains,
Made verses heavy as o'er-loaded wains.
Love was their theme; but love that dwelt in stones,
Or charm'd the stars in their concentric zones;
Love that did first the nuptial bond conclude
'Twixt immaterial form and matter rude;
Love that was riddled, sphered, transacted, spelt,
Sublimed, projected, every thing but felt.
Or if in age, in orders, or the cholic,
They damn'd all loving as a heathen frolic;
They changed their topic, but in style the same,
Adored their Maker as they would their dame.
Thus *Donne*, not first, but greatest of the line,

Of stubborn thoughts a garland thought to twine;
To his fair maid brought cabalistic posies,
And sung quaint ditties of metempsychosis;
Twists iron pokers into true love-knots,
Coining hard words, not found in polyglots.'

(Vol. ii. p. 321.)

Many of the best poems in these volumes indicate, in a striking manner, that peculiar temperament of which it has been remarked that 'a humorous sadness, and a humorous mirth, are but its opposite poles.' Habits of seclusion, concurring with a pliant imagination, a nervous constitution, and a leisure which yet could never be idle, had developed in their author nearly all the 'humours' which belong to, and sometimes overlay, the poetical character. They are among the qualities which flavour his poetry most richly, whether the predominating mood be pensive or joyous, fitful or grave, that of an anxious foresight, or a half-sportive pathos. The tenderer moods have left behind the choicest fruits. Among them are to be found many love-poems, which, if not coloured with the deeper and darker hues of passion, have yet detained the fleeting lights of a most affectionate fancy. Those lights might sometimes be called lunar gleams; but they are the moonlight of a warm climate. To this class we would refer the stanzas, 'To Somebody,' the sonnets beginning 'I loved thee once,' 'Is love a fancy or a feeling?' 'Inania Munera,' 'I saw thee in the beauty of thy spring,' &c. &c.

Another and a larger class in this collection may be described as philosophical poetry. Its originality and force are well set forth by a diction which, at all times manly and correct, could be exquisite when it pleased, and yet could, on occasions, drop upon the plainness of a child's speech. His later poetry belongs very frequently to this species; nor can we sufficiently regret that the specimens presented to us had not always the benefit of the author's corrections. How much poetry, especially that of a high intellectual order, gains from the author's last corrections we need hardly observe: polished steel does not differ more from the rough metal than the last copy of a poem frequently differs from the first. Hartley Coleridge's works were frequently both conceived and struck off with extraordinary rapidity—a circumstance owing as well to an acquired tact as to that spontaneity which characterised his genius: but the best of them were also elaborated with all needful care, a care, perhaps, most felt by the reader when least seen. The meditative poetry of the last half century, if not its best, is probably that which best expresses the spirit of the age. Among its highest efforts

may be named not a few poems in these volumes, such as the sonnets beginning, 'Pains I have known that cannot be again,' 'What is the meaning of the word "sublime?"' 'From infancy 'to retrospective old,' 'When I survey the long and deep and 'wide,' 'Accuse not gracious Nature of neglect.' This sonnet on 'Freedom' will not, we fear, give satisfaction to the Char-
tists: —

' Say, what is Freedom? What the life of souls
Which all who know are bound to keep, or die,
And who knows not is dead? In vain we pry
In the dark archives and tenacious scrolls
Of written law, though Time embrace the rolls
In his lank arms, and shed his yellow light
On every barbarous word. Eternal Right
Works its own way, and evermore controls
Its own free essence. Liberty is Duty,
Not License. Every pulse that beats
At the glad summons of imperious beauty
Obeys a law. The very cloud that fleets
Along the dead green surface of the hill
Is ruled and scatter'd by a Godlike will.' (Vol. ii. p. 50.)

The following, which traces one of our vaguest instincts to its seat in the Conscience, is a specimen of its author's psychological, as our former extract is of his political philosophy: —

FEAR.

' Dim child of darkness and faint-echoing space,
That still art just behind, and never here,
Death's herald shadow, unimagined Fear;
Thou antic, that dost multiply a face,
Which hath no self, but finds in every place
A body, feature, voice, and circumstance;
Yet art most potent in the wide expanse
Of unbelief, — may I beseech thy grace?
Thou art a spirit of no certain clan,
For thou wilt fight for either God or Devil.
Man is thy slave, and yet thy lord is man;
The human heart creates thee good or evil:
As goblin, ghost, or fiend, I ne'er have known thee;
But as myself, my sinful self, I own thee.'

(Vol. ii. p. 54.)

With the meditative poems may be classed a series with which the collection closes, consisting of pieces on theological subjects. The tone of these poems is serious, earnest, and devout, rather than impassioned. They are very unequal in merit. A few of them, which are doubtless to be regarded but as links in an incomplete series, seem to us but colder versions of narratives

more poetic in the prose of Holy Scripture; others (those probably which suggested the scheme) embody a genuine vision of some historic fact, or present to us a profound sentiment with the softness at once and the vividness of poetry. They frequently express subtle as well as pregnant truths in singularly condensed language, as in the following lines on Faith:—

'Think not the faith by which the just shall live
Is a dead creed — a map correct of heaven;
Far less a feeling fond and fugitive,
A thoughtless gift withdrawn as soon as given.
It is an affirmation and an act
That bids eternal truth be present fact.'

There is much significance also in a sonnet entitled 'Faith how guarded':—

'Yes, thou dost well to build a fence about
Thine inward faith, and mount a stalwart guard
Of answers, to oppose invading doubt.
All aids are needful, for the strife is hard;
But still be sure the truth within to cherish —
Truths long besieged too oft of hunger perish.'

The Bible is the source in which he seeks objects for Faith. For the deficiencies of a written document, the record of the past, our poet seeks a supplement in the 'living voice' of Nature:—

'The word were but a blank, a hollow sound,
If He that spake it were not speaking still,—
If all the light and all the shade around
Were aught but issues of Almighty will.
'Sweet girl, believe that every bird that sings,
And every flower that stars the elastic sod,
And every thought the happy summer brings
To thy pure spirit, is a word of God.'

An interesting portion of these poems might, in these days of illustrated books, be called 'illustrations of the Bible,' picturing forth, as they do, some scene from the Old or New Testament, and closing with a line or two that points the moral. They will remind the reader occasionally of old Drummond of Hawthornden, and certainly are not inferior to the best sonnets in his 'Flowers of Sion.' We refer especially to 'Enock,' 'Hagar,' and 'Moses,' which last we shall quote.

'She left her babe, and went away to weep,
And listen'd oft to hear if he did cry;
But the great river sung his lullaby,
And unseen angels fann'd his balmy sleep.
And yet his innocence itself might keep;

The sacred silence of his slumbrous smile
 Makes peace in all the monster-breeding Nile;
 For God even now is moving in the sweep
 Of mighty waters. Little dreams the maid,
 The royal maid, that comes to woo the wave
 • With her smooth limbs beneath the trembling shade
 Of silver-chaliced lotus, what a child
 Her freak of pity is ordain'd to save!
 How terrible the thing that looks so mild.'

(Vol. ii. p. 349.)

With the following we must conclude our extracts:—

'MULTUM DILEXIT.'

'She sat and wept beside His feet; the weight
 Of sin oppress'd her heart; for all the blame,
 And the poor malice of the worldly shame,
 To her was past, extinct, and out of date.
 Only the *sin* remain'd, — the leprous state:—
 She would be melted by the heat of love,
 By fires far fiercer than are blown to prove
 And purge the silver ore adulterate.
 She sat and wept, and with her untress'd hair
 Still wiped the feet she was so blest to touch;
 And He wiped off the soiling of despair
 From her sweet soul, because she loved so much.
 I am a sinner, full of doubts and fears,
 Make me a humble thing of love and tears.'

(Vol. ii. p. 387.)

The characteristics of Hartley Coleridge's poetry will have been better set forth by the specimens which we have given of its different classes than by any elaborate analysis. That it is true poetry the most careless reader cannot doubt. Its predominant spirit, especially in his later works, is that of a meditative humanity, which marks him on the whole as a pupil in the Wordsworthian school, notwithstanding a buoyancy and sweetness which often remind us of his father's most felicitous, if not his most elevated, vein. The temperament of his poetry, sanguine, pleasurable, and fitful, resembles also that of the elder Coleridge; while in his sonnets he attained an artistic perfection of form never reached by the other. In passion he was inferior to both the poets named; its place being supplied by a fancy which sometimes strayed in the direction of prettinesses, if not of conceits, but more often enlivened his verse with a poignant wit, and gave a sharper edge, and more brilliant relief, to weighty thought. Had he written at an earlier period, future critics could not fail to assign to his genius a place yet higher than will now perhaps be awarded to it; for in that case his

originality would have been as unquestioned as the freshness, sweetness, and truthfulness of his verse. Poetry, however, no doubt borrows from itself as well as from human life; which is one reason for the copiousness with which, after a long frost, its fountains gush forth at particular periods. Poets learn to sing as children learn to speak, in part by imitation: the imitative power will be liveliest where the apprehensive faculty is most alert, and the sympathies are strongest; and assuredly Hartley Coleridge's nature must have been more sluggish than it was, if he had not caught some part of his inspiration from that which floated in the air he daily breathed.

This consideration is in itself some answer to the question, — why, with powers so various and well trained, and with ample leisure, he did not execute a work of a larger and more important order? Other explanations might also be offered, founded on the peculiarities of his intellect and moral being. His biographer suggests that there 'was some faculty wanting 'in his mind, necessary for the completion of any great 'whole.' The deficiency, he seems to think, lay in the power to systematise. The elder Coleridge, he remarks, could methodise the most magnificent scheme in imagination, and by an intuitive discernment of its central idea; but yet could seldom persuade his thoughts to 'arrange themselves within 'artificial limits,'—'the centrifugal and centripetal forces of his 'mind were well balanced; but the foci of his thought were so 'distant that their orbit became practically unlimited, though 'each portion contained the law of its return, and the prophecy 'of its completion. No such power was ever exhibited by his 'son; he does not appear ever to have realised even the conception of any great whole.' Such a want of completeness in conception would imply a defect of the creative faculty likewise, since the imagination can only create what it has previously conceived, and in its conception the idea of the complete work must be, at least germinally, contained. A plastic imagination is, indeed, very different from a creative energy; and in Hartley Coleridge it was more predominant. Yet on the other hand, no intellectual deficiency need be supposed in order to account for a discrepancy between what his poetry was and what it might have been. We have already remarked how much that poetry owed to the large and generous moral disposition of which it is the expression. The lesson would be incomplete if we did not admit that it lost proportionably from the defect of strength in his moral character. We may often indulge in the stronger vices with apparent impunity; but for every weakness Nature extorts a forfeit; and the penance which she most often

imposes is one which illudes observation—she denies us the power of fully exerting our powers. In art, as in life, a governing will must marshall all the powers. Self-control is the ‘leathern girdle’ which, seeming but to restrain, braces the adventurous artist for his ascent up the mountain side. He must be equally prompt to act and patient to wait. His courage must not be impulsive only, nor must his prudence degenerate into caution. His sympathies must advance uncheered by vanity, and unchecked by repulse. His studies must be deliberate acts, converging towards a definite end, not merely an indulgence of curiosity or an escape from the cares of life. If he would be Nature’s priest, offering her sacrifice, he needs somewhat of ascetic discipline and renunciation; remembering that though genius must ever be, in some measure, indebted to the mere temperament of genius, it yet should not draw too largely for nourishment upon its meaner part. If he would be Nature’s missionary, preaching her faith, he must dare great things: he must not cling to creeks and neighbouring coasts, trafficking but with the products of daily experience, and the spoils of chance encounters: he must push forth boldly, and tempt the deep.

How far, it may be asked, did the circumstances of Hartley Coleridge’s life interfere with the largest exercise of his poetic powers? Their influence, we should say, must have been adverse, so far as they deprived him of that masculine invigoration which is often produced by the friendly oppugnancy of pursuits independent of inclination. He would have doubtless been a greater poet if he had been less exclusively a poet: for the stronger, and therefore the loftier the stem, the higher will its blossom and fruitage wave in the air. It is obvious, however, that avocations so utterly at variance with his whole nature as the management of a school must have tended rather to paralyse than to discipline his powers. Literary success might have stimulated his mind to more of continuous exertion; yet on this subject no general rule can be laid down. A mixture of prosperity and adversity seems as necessary for our moral culture as an alternation of sunshine and rain is for vegetable growth: but whether genius be developed most by the bright or the dark ministration depends mainly on the temperament with which it is associated. Melancholy and saturnine natures, especially if they be also proud and irascible, are often provoked to higher exertion by what they regard as neglect or injustice; and under such a stimulus become conscious of powers which, till precipitated into action, were locked up in reserve. Tenderer temperaments, on the other hand, require applause to enable them to shake off their diffidence. Sympathy is the

air they breathe; and if they find it not for their intellectual creations, rather than labour without its cheering influence, their genius spends itself upon those associations and pursuits in which sympathy may always be bestowed and occasionally received. 'Necessity,' we are told, 'always affected Hartley Coleridge with the touch of a torpedo.' This is commonly the case where the active powers, however large in themselves, are not in proportion to the sensibilities, or where the moral sensibilities are encompassed and embarrassed by a throng of nervous sensibilities. Hope is the conducting spirit of such a character, which finds it easier to advance than to stand; and to natures so constituted success is but a minister of Hope.

Such support Hartley Coleridge needed in an especial degree. The humility which is impressed upon all his poems, and the spirit of compunction which stamps upon the best among them their peculiar character, at once searching and subduing, were probably not favourable to those habits of mind which engage men in large enterprises. For the poet, however, as for the man, good and ill fortune were so blended that it is often hard to know them apart. He had a high training as well as a high gift, the helps as well as the hindrances of a poetic age, the benefits, as well as the disadvantages, which proceed from the absence of contemporary fame; he had nature, books, friends, and leisure. A man with these advantages, and fifty-two years of life, may generally be considered to have put forth what was in him and was accessible. So large a bequest as he has left us is seldom so unalloyed a one. A noble moral spirit will long continue to be diffused from his poetry: a moral lesson not less deep is to be found in that poetry taken in connexion with his life. In our remarks on the latter we have but glanced at principles of large and general concern, enforced by himself in many a poem rich in 'heart wisdom,' and strong to diffuse it. Our imperfect sketch can easily be filled up for himself by any reader who is able to afford to so large a storehouse of genuine poetry the time that it deserves. In Hartley Coleridge's 'Essays and 'Marginalia,' he will find all the additional notes necessary for the study of their author's genius, as well as a varied range of discriminative criticism and discursive thought. We regret that our present limits compel us thus briefly to refer to them.

ART. IV. — *Return of the Number and Nature of the Accidents and the Injuries to Life and Limb which have occurred on the Railways in Great Britain and Ireland, from the 1st of July to the 31st of December, 1850, together with the Number of Passengers conveyed during that Period.* Ordered to be printed 7th May, 1851.

EXEMPTION from fatal accidents, as well as from many minor calamities that flesh is heir to, has long been popularly counted among the blessings of pastoral simplicity. But the probability of any such exemption is questioned by the sceptical: and Arcadia keeps no statistics. This is a controversy, which may well wait. Not so the question, how far we can exempt the denizens of the artificially crowded and restless world in which we live, from any considerable proportion of these evils. Since it is clear that, — whether or not it would be abstractly better to go backward, — onward is the direction in which the world is going and must go; and that the crowding, the restlessness, the untiring energy of exertion, and the marvellous fertility of invention which characterise our own days, will only be enlarged in those of our descendants. At the very outset of any inquiries bearing on such a subject, it is a pleasant thing to remember that science has ever hitherto been able to control its strength to good purposes; and that the motive powers which have possessed the most terrible force, have been under the most absolute discipline and restraint; that, for instance, when the murderer has fled from his victim on the wings of steam, science has overtaken him by a still speedier messenger, and has ranged the officers of justice at the termination of his flight, standing there calm, instructed, and collected, ready to examine his bloody hands, a hundred miles from the place of crime.

Among the various tests of the efficacy with which human institutions fulfil their social office, surely none can be so sensitive as the average vitality of the community. Whenever anything in them is wrong, if it be wrong on a considerable scale, it must tend to add, with more or less remoteness, to the insecurity of human life. The promotion of all such worthy inducements to exertion as excite without exhausting the physical and mental energies, — the regulated liberty which protects without invading, — the high-toned social atmosphere in which depravity cannot live, — the external tranquillity which exempts the body from violence, and relieves the mind from anxiety, —

the well-regulated monetary or commercial arrangements which save the public from fluctuations and convulsions, — the careful removal of external noxious agencies ; — all these are more or less the creatures of legislation, and have an influence on vitality, in so much that where they are materially deficient, — where men are tyrannical, greedy, dishonest, reckless of the safety of their fellow-men and of their own, where they wallow in moral and physical impurity, and oscillate between abject poverty and uncertain riches, — we may be assured that the traces of these malign influences, if they possess any such record, will be palpably marked in their tables of mortality.

The statistics of most subjects often present a startling appearance to those who have already arrived on them at independent conclusions of their own. There are few who would be fortunate enough to approach by guess-work to the exact number of deaths caused by violent accidents in the United Kingdom. Some would enumerate all they remember seeing in newspapers, — others would launch into a sea of figures, of which they do not know the actual meaning. In 1838, according to the Report of the Registrar-general, the number of deaths from violence in England and Wales was 11,727. Either there had been some defect in the returns for that year, or the causes of such calamities were decreasing, while population increased: for the number in the ensuing year was 11,632; in 1840, 11,594; and in 1841, 11,000. We do not find in the Registrar's Reports of later years the causes of death so separated and distinguished, — at least over the whole kingdom.* Scotland and Ireland are both destitute of the valuable machinery of the registration system; so that we know no more directly of vital statistics in these countries, than in China and Japan. But taking the English returns, as a foundation, we may safely calculate that the present population of

* It might be natural to expect that, as the same uniform classes of facts have to be recorded by him every year, the Reports of the Registrar-general should be as uniform as an almanac or tide-table. Each annual volume, however, is an independent book with distinct subjects. And a cursory examination of the volumes shows a satisfactory reason for this. The materials collected by the registration system are of the same class every year; but the ways in which they may be used and applied to each other, especially with reference to a succession of years, are infinitely varied. A considerable number of these applications even would occupy too much bulk for an annual Report, and so each year presents its separate combinations: in one, we have the influence of the atmosphere or of politics on mortality — in another, that of trade, on marriages and births — and so on.

the United Kingdom is double that of England and Wales in 1840. Making allowance for the proportional number of violent deaths having in the mean decreased, we may perhaps now count them, in round numbers at 20,000 in the year. This is in itself a vast mass of calamity. It would appal the world if it came in considerable instalments. All Europe was startled by the accident which killed 1200 people at the rejoicings for the marriage of Marie Antoinette, and which was in some measure repeated on that of Marie Louise. Our five great naval victories in the late war cost us only 1233 killed, and 3626 wounded; while 20,000 were probably beyond the British loss in battle in any one of its campaigns. Twenty thousand deaths would have cut no mean figure in the human sacrifices of Napoleon: and it will be remembered that the result of the three bloody days of the battle of Paris, was deemed to be grossly exaggerated when the deaths were computed at 8,000.

To avert a portion, say a half or a quarter, of the violent deaths incident to peaceful occupations, would surely be a great boon to the community. We see in other departments of the dark catalogue, what the energy of man can accomplish in rendering life more secure. If we look at the element of starvation, which in some countries is so conspicuous, we shall find that the spirit and mechanism of English society have been brought to bear effectually against it, and that—partly from self-exertion, and partly from the application of the Poor Law, where self-exertion has proved insufficient—the mortality from this cause, more miserable yet perhaps than from violence, is comparatively small. It was, in 1838, 167; in 1839, 130; and in 1840, 137. The mortality test, as lately shown to the Metropolitan Association, by Dr. Southwood Smith, gauges the saving of human life, which will be effected by improving the dwellings of the industrious poor.

Of course, the numbers of the dead only represent a certain per-centage of the direct sufferers on these occasions. How many are injured for every one whose life is extinguished by any class of violent agencies, would be a curious object of inquiry: it would be found to vary greatly with the circumstances which occasion the violence. We happen to alight at this moment on a note of the casualties caused by an attempt, in 1828, to rush out of a church at Kirkcaldy. The Reverend Edward Irving was addressing a crowded audience; an alarm arose for the safety of the building; 28 of his congregation were crushed to death, and 150 injured. In the first quarterly railway accidents' return for 1851, the number of persons killed 'from circumstances beyond their own control' is 3, the number injured, 33; while, by the

class of accidents set down as 'owing to their own misconduct 'or want of caution,' the passengers killed were 7, those injured only 3. But in the succeeding quarterly return the proportion is still more startling; since, where 9 passengers are killed, 138 are injured from circumstances beyond their own control,—though, of passengers suffering from their own misconduct, &c., there are 9 injuries to 13 deaths. A strange and unexpected disproportion this, arising apparently from the injuries caused by slight collisions.

But the immediate deaths, or the immediate wounds, are not all which the public suffer from such calamities. First comes that indefinite circle, disappearing as it widens, of those who suffer in their affections, their interests, or their sympathies. But even in the still waters beyond the last perceptible vibration,—where, outwardly indeed, people might not only seem callous to the misfortunes of the sufferers, but selfishly exulting in their own exemption,—there is a jarring of the nerves, an inward unsettledness, which makes life uneasy, and expands into positive distress as often as the excited imagination succeeds in drawing analogies between the thinker's position and that of the sufferer. In many instances some permanent shock to the nerves, even madness itself, has been attributed to the circumstances under which the patient became acquainted with some frightful accident. In the case of parties present at any of the great catastrophes, as for example in the Sutton tunnel, who shall venture to sum up the mental horror suffered there by the 1,500 victims for three quarters of an hour, amidst damp and darkness, uproar and confusion, the finding of the dead and wounded, while the work of death was going on at intervals,—no one knowing when the next remorseless crash would come, and whom and how many it would slay! Could the calling over of the guillotine lists in the Parisian prisons be an ordeal of greater agony? Yet the primary cause of all this horror was an engine insufficient for the weight attached to it.

Perhaps we have said quite enough, but the importance of the matter will not be questioned; and it will be no waste of the reader's time if we can present him with a few considerations tending to show how far it is within human power to modify those violent jerks and oscillations of the physical world which snap the thread of life, and scatter the hopes and affections clustering round it in desolation and despair.

In the first place we must set it down as an axiom, that in the accomplishment of such an end 'money is no object;' that wherever life can be directly and certainly saved, without some

counteracting evil,—as, for instance, without causing any crime or recklessness that may afterwards have more deleterious effects on vitality, it *ought* to be saved by the State at whatever cost. When Captain Hunter, the governor of New South Wales, lost his ship by putting back for a man who had fallen overboard, he vindicated himself before a court-martial by saying that he ‘considered the life of a British seaman of more value than any ship in his Majesty’s navy;’ and we have always considered the remark as sound as it was humane, presuming it to be applied to circumstances where neither the national defence, nor the safety of others, would be endangered. *Nulla unquam de vitâ hominis cunctatio longa est.* If a human being is in risk of his life, and can possibly be saved; if, case a well, for instance, has fallen in, or a building has given way, and there is one beneath who may yet be spared to breathe and live with his fellow men,—is there any wealth, or labour, or enthusiasm, that will be withheld to procure his rescue? Indeed, large as we have calculated the number of deaths by violence, we question whether the proportion would be as small in any other country exposed to an equal multiplicity of dangers.* The cool indifference to life, by which as late as the time of Henry the Eighth we were supposed to be nationally distinguished, has passed into a respect for it which scarcely allows us to hang a murderer. The fatalities, of which we have to complain, have arisen not so much from apathy or bad intention, as from a want of systematic arrangements having the safety of the public for their immediate end.

Though we fear that the few remarks we are about to offer may be characterised by the looseness which generally attends an attempt for the first time to classify and systematise utterly vague and chaotic materials, we shall commence ana-

* As the statistics of this element of mortality are so imperfect at home, we cannot expect to obtain them in a very complete state in foreign countries. In France, according to some tables published by the Registrar-general, accidental deaths were, in 1843, 6,436, and in 1844, 6,729. This would be a small comparative number, if it formed a considerable proportion of the kinds of death counted violent in England. But, while their habits of life are exposed to much fewer risks, there is on the other hand an excess of those worst kinds of violent death which are excluded from our consideration on this occasion. Thus, in 1843, the murders were 306, and in 1844, they were 403. In England, the number of murders in 1840 was 65, and the number in the two preceding years was 156 — being an average of 78 for each year. In France, the suicides were — for 1843, 2,142, and for 1844, 2,200. In 1839, the number in England was 943.

lytically by adducing two propensities as the great productive cause of fatal accidents. The one is the spirit of gambling, apparently an inherent propensity in mankind, though mostly in the most barbarous; the other is a more topical prejudice or superstition against permitting any thing to interfere with trade. From the valuable things which men will stake, life is not exempt. The most reckless chances are constantly run by the ignorant and the brutal; but even highly civilised people are not entirely exempt from the propensity. Fool-hardiness persists in playing with edge tools the same as with blunt: and the love of excitement and the reliance on their own good fortune add to the perils not only of the Mississippi, but of the Hudson and the Humber. A person of good social position and recognised prudence will commit himself to a questionable steam boat, in the full knowledge that after a certain number of voyages it must founder, but in the trust that the fatal event is not to take place on this particular trip. Men sit without apprehension in crowded meeting-rooms, theatres, and churches, conscious of the edifices being so constructed that, were an alarm of fire to be raised, there would be imminent danger of their being crushed to death by the frantic multitude rushing to escape by narrow doors and winding passages. If no one would knowingly either embark in an unsafe steam-boat, or put himself under the guidance of an unskilful captain or driver, or enter the doors of any public building not properly supplied with the means of tumultuous exit,—if individuals, in short, would run no unreasonable risks,—there would be a self-acting remedy for the deficiencies by which life is so often sacrificed. But we must take the gambling propensity as an innate characteristic of human nature—a fact never more strongly exemplified, in a small way, than on the late boiler explosion at Bristol, or, on a still larger scale, by the passengers of an American steamer subscribing to pay the penalty rather than wait till their vessel was examined. So viewing it, perhaps a method may be found for mitigating its mischief.

We are not now unaccustomed to act on the uniform returns of statistics. They have brought the phenomena which used to be consigned to the chaotic province of chance into systematic order. Among their lessons is this one, very material to the present point,—that those calamities which are to individuals matter of *chance* are to the public matter of *cause and effect*. If there be in existence throughout the country a certain number of agencies of destruction, A. B. and C. may calculate on escaping them, but a determinate number of the community must suffer. Thus the question, so far as the public at large

are concerned, is no longer one of uncertainty, but of ascertained results. The State can enumerate its dead and wounded from any particular cause of calamity. It can then balance the loss by death and injury against the expense of removing the cause, and calculate whether it shall incur that expense. If we begin at the most reckless end of the community, we find among the mining population, and those connected with the rough labour of public works, a large number of casualties. The workman habitually neglects to use the Davy lamp, or for high wages works in dangerous cuttings; he acts, as though he had put into a lottery,—but the consequence is, that a large number of his class are annually killed by explosions and other accidents, and the corresponding pressure from their deaths appears arithmetically on the poor rate. If in blasting, an iron rod be used instead of a copper one, the chances may be small indeed that a spark shall be elicited and the powder ignited; the sanguine miner therefore takes his chance. But the country would be saved a small amount of annual mortality by the systematic substitution of the safest material. To come to instances of more rare occurrence, which yet it would be practicable to classify over long intervals. On an evening in February, 1849, an alarm of fire was raised in the Dunlop Street theatre of Glasgow, from one of the audience having attempted to light a pipe. There was a frantic rush to the door. At the spot where the money is collected the passage of a theatre is generally narrow. There, some of the foremost of the crowd fell and literally plugged up the passage. Shrieks of distress and alarm made those behind only press more fiercely onward, and in a few minutes the narrow passage was a compact mass of human carcases. Sixty-five lives were thus sacrificed to the neglect of structural rules which are laid down by Vitruvius*, are exemplified in the remains of ancient amphitheatres, and were enforceable by the Roman edile police, on the sound old principle that no structures of a character calculated to endanger the public safety should be permitted to exist. Such accidents as the Dunlop Street and the Kirkcaldy tragedy are ever occurring at intervals of a few years; and we are all acquainted with edifices where the same thing would occur to-morrow if a panic terror should take possession of a full

* Aditus complures et spatiosos oportet disponere, nec conjunctos superiores inferioribus, sed ex omnibus locis perpetuos et directos sine inversuris faciendos; uti cum populus dimittitur de spectaculis, ne comprimatur, sed habeat ex omnibus locis exitus separatos sine impedimento.—Vitruvius, lib. v. ch. iii.; *De Theatro ejusque salubri Constitutione.*

audience assembled within them. Suppose the top of the Crystal Palace had been carried off the other day by Mr. Graham's balloon, and its 60,000 visitors had had to struggle over each other for their escape, how grateful they would have felt for the simplicity of its construction.

As statistical science brings us directly to the sources of these calamities, the progress of the engineering and other practical sciences is ever bringing their causes more completely under human control. In the elements, in the structure of the earth, and in the muscular power of irrational animals, there are sources of destruction, which of course it is beyond the power of man with certainty to overcome. An extreme instance of this was the fall of the Rossberg in Switzerland, where a cake of mountain stratum slipping down some thousands of feet into a valley, buried a village within the crust of the earth, and cast a lake in one huge wave over the district at its opposite extremity, sweeping away houses and villages. Of a like uncontrollable character are earthquakes; such volcanic eruptions as those which became renowned by the death of the older Pliny, and the burial of cities for the instruction of posterity; the avalanches which in spring sometimes heap up the rich narrow valleys of the Swiss graziers with the wintry burden of their overloaded mountains; the inundations, fed from the same sources, and rushing over the alluvial flats which the mineral and vegetable detritus laid down by previous floods has tempted man to hoard and economize as riches; the swamping of the diked polders under the level of the sea in such countries as Holland, 'where the broad ocean leans against the land,' and sometimes breaks through it; and not the least terrible, though perhaps the rarest, a forest territory on fire, with the flames devouring unpenetrated and unknown woods, and travelling as fast before the wind as a flood comes down a hill:—such was the New Brunswick conflagration of 1825, which, after laying waste thousands of square miles of forest, bore down on the poor emigrant town of Miramichi, and burnt it like a piece of paper.

Even though utterly unable to control them, science, however, can teach men to flee from places exposed by nature to such calamities. But in our artificial world, a red signal hoisted instead of a green, a plate wrong laid, an insecurely welded axle, a deficiency of water in a boiler, may cause in a travelling village a calamity not less terrible than the fall of the Swiss mountain or some great earthquake. Vast is the power set in motion by science; but, on the other hand, it is more easy to hold it in check for the safety of the thousand travellers

committed to its mercy, than to curb a spirited horse with a single rider on its back. The progressive substitution of scientifically-created powers for those provided by nature, in the wind, the waters, and the brute creation, makes us, with all our freedom and restlessness, the appendages of a sort of system of machinery, all the operations of which, however potent they may be, are capable of acquiring the regularity and adaptability of clockwork. Hence arise new functions and responsibilities, suited to the means possessed of serving the public by protecting it, or, justly speaking, by performing with precision and accuracy the duties for which the public pay. The more we become civilised, the more we are dependent on each other; and the change in this peculiarity of the progress of our race, wrought and made apparent to us by any rapid improvement in one department of men's habits, becomes positively startling when it is reflected on. Take, for instance, locomotion. The pedestrian, with his staff in his hand, crossing the desert where other travellers adopt the same primitive conveyance, has himself in his own hands. The horseman is not so entirely self-dependent; he is in some measure at the disposal of a brute, but his own skill and courage still avail him much. He who is car-borne has gone a step further in giving up the governance of himself. In case he travel in a vehicle driven by himself or his servant, he retains a considerable command over his fate; though if he travel in a public stage coach he ceases in a great degree, but not absolutely, to have influence over or choice concerning the dangers to which he is to be exposed. The next step, however, in speeding the traveller on his way—the railway train—completes the transition and transfers him from his own care to that of a railway company. The passenger in the express may do much towards endangering his life, as by sticking his head out of the window, or jumping out while the train is in motion; on the other hand, he is utterly helpless for self-protection in case of a collision or any other crisis. He may be excused therefore, perhaps, should he not consent to trust his life and limbs to the cautious foresight and skill of stipendiaries along the line, but should desire to be under the protection of a code of regulations which, instead of making his preservation a matter of merit to the officers who have him in charge, shall render it criminal to expose him to danger.

For the purpose we have in view on this occasion, the calamities which men bring on others are considered distinct from those which they bring on themselves. While human nature remains what it is, careless masons will walk on ridges where they may lose their balance, rash sportsmen will take

dangerous leaps, and bold swimmers miscalculate the strength they require to reach the shore. People will try wings and balloons, and experiment upon their own safety as *in corpore vili*. To give advice against personal imprudences of this kind, is the province of the ethical philosopher or the religious teacher. The object of the present paper is to indicate causes of destruction, which being caused by large operations, are removable by improvement in the methods of conducting them, and consequently by legislation, — which, though it cannot often save people from themselves, may protect them from calamities occasioned by the selfishness of their fellow men. Nor is it assumed, that even from this arena hazards can be excluded; it will be sufficient if causes of superfluous and gratuitous risk be seriously reduced. There will be danger and violent death in the world, as long as there is heroic enterprise and a high sense of duty conducting to self-sacrifice. Not only the sailor and the soldier, but the chemist, the geologist, the physician seeking the means of combating with disease, the clergyman communicating the consolations of religion to the dying, even the patient scholar at his sleepless desk, — all incur and court the risk of personal injury and abbreviated life. Some of the humbler occupations most advantageous to mankind are notoriously attended with danger — as that of the miner, the mariner, the fisher, even the bricklayer and house-painter; but the risk which *must* be incurred is often small in comparison with that which is unnecessary and useless. No one speaks of closing the navigation of the Thames because the sailor's is a dangerous calling; yet it has been questioned whether, in order to drive a profitable passage trade, at a penny a head, a speculator should be allowed to boil a high-pressure engine which may blow fifty or sixty people to atoms. We must have coal mines, — but is it necessary that for a few additional shillings of profit the butty shall risk a dozen or two of lives? So we shall have railway travelling as abundant and effective as ever, even after it is ruled that the lives of fifteen hundred people are not to be risked to save the expense of keeping a guard at a tunnel's mouth.

The sources of calamity which arise from men, who having a charge over the safety of others, culpably neglect their duty, may be divided into three principal classes — structure of edifices, public and private; locomotion; and gregarious employment. The third we shall find to be mixed up with the other two; as, for instance, in railway service, in manufactories, and in mines. Already some notice has been taken of dangerously defective public structures; more may be afterwards supplied, and perhaps

it would be trespassing on the department of the architect to go farther into the technicalities of structure and attempt to indicate the necessary protective arrangements. The danger, which in this department it has ever been considered the most essential to guard against, is fire. It is on the whole, however, with all its appalling attendants, generally little destructive of life in comparison with its devastation of property. In the great Hamburg fire of 1842, which destroyed sixty-one streets, and rendered 20,000 people houseless, the casualties to life were only 39. In the Registrar-general's returns, the deaths from conflagration are not distinguished from others caused by burning, which are all classed under 'chemical injuries.' In the two years 1838 and 1839, there were collectively in the metropolis 2600 deaths attributed to violence, and of these 414 were by fire — 136 males and 278 females — the preponderance of the latter evidently indicating ordinary household operations as the chief cause. In the manufacturing towns of Birmingham, Manchester, Salford, Liverpool, and West Derby, collectively, out of 693 violent deaths in 1839, 170 were from burning — here 99 were males and 71 females. The erection of party walls through the roof is supposed now to secure the metropolis from sweeping conflagrations like those which laid waste Hamburg and have occasionally desolated the American cities. Among the last, its abundant supply of water must now make an exception of New York. On the other hand, it may be questioned, if our provincial wood and brick-built towns are safe from such a calamity. Nor is the state of warfare with this great enemy in which London is kept — the continued trepidation, the preparations for flight, the necessity of a constantly embodied force, — indicative of that high progress in civilisation which should appear in the prevention of causes of calamity rather than in its encounter and conquest. We must look forward to structural discoveries achieving the higher triumphs; and perhaps the Crystal Palace, among its other services, may, especially by its iron work, lead to the source of discoveries in this direction. Though many of the accidental deaths of London are caused by vehicles, and some by disturbances, undoubtedly we may attribute the greater portion to structural causes. But whatever be the causes, it is interesting to remark that in this great centre of energy and motion — of apparent confusion and carelessness — life does not run more risks, indeed a trifle less, than its average risk all over England. According to the Registrar-general's Report for 1848, the numbers of violent deaths in the metropolis were in the years from 1840 to 1847 inclusive as follows, — in 1840, 1279; in 1841, 1174; in 1842,

1253; in 1843, 1142; in 1844, 1301; in 1845, 1329; in 1846, 1651; and in 1847, 1578.

We shall have to say something more concerning structural causes when we come to consider the casualties incident to particular employments; in the mean time it appears to be in the department of travelling and conveyance from place to place that existing defects are productive of the most alarming evils, and that the demand for improvement is most urgent.

The habits of the old world mariner, trained in sailing vessels, are not well adapted to the modern system of steam navigation. He has been early imbued with the feeling that his career is to be one of inevitable perils, and that happiness is to be sought, not in efforts to obviate them, but in the enjoyment of the present and the dissipation of reflection. His notions of danger are associated with phenomena so far beyond the reach of human power, that he becomes a fatalist, waiting his time, and scorning precautions which appear but despicable when measured with the great perils of the deep. Hence a sailor seldom knows how to swim; it is a paltry accomplishment, never likely to serve any better purpose than the prolongation of his agony. He has no great respect even for boats as a means of escape; and to offer him a mackintosh safety buoy would only be to encounter his unutterable ridicule. Experience has too sadly shown, that our coasting travellers in those machine-driven vessels, where the powers both of action and destruction are so delicately obedient to human management, are not safe in the hands of these fatalists. It is not long since the public were astounded at learning that the master and mate of a steamer, in apparent ignorance that animal life requires to be fed with fresh air, battened down their passengers' air-tight into the hold like dry goods, and killed seventy-five of them. When the master of the *Orion* was brought to trial, and punished for the carelessness with which he ran his vessel on a well-known rock in good daylight, the incident—not of the wreck, but of the punishment,—was as startling to the class to which the master belonged, as the impeachment of Strafford to Charles the First's courtiers. They looked upon it, we believe, as gross injustice,—punishing a man like a felon, and merely for his bad luck! Let us hope that the Mercantile Marine Act of last session will do something to relieve the public of its danger from seamen of this class.

As the power for mischief in a railway is still greater than in a steam ship, while there is a more specific command over the elements of power, a sense of higher responsibility ought to be entertained, and additional securities provided. In some measure

this has been the case. We have no doubt of the truth of the assertion often made, that, allowing for the extent travelled, there is a smaller per-centage of casualties on railways than in coaches. It is difficult to get any figures to bear on this question; but we see in one of the Registrar-general's returns that in 1841 the number of deaths caused by waggons, &c. (the &c. meaning, we presume, other vehicles) was 978. On our vast railway-lines, whose trains accomplish between sixty and seventy millions of individual journeys, the numbers slain, including passengers, railway servants, and the public at large, were in the same year, 1841, 270; in 1847, 211; in 1848, 240; in 1849, 202; and in 1850, 216. Remembering how completely the system is under the command of science and conduct, we hope to see the day when, even with a vastly increased traffic, such a mortality will be looked on as a tradition of railway travelling in its early barbarous state. It used to be thought that a certain class of railway accidents were as inevitable as earthquakes. A belief is now entertained among scientific men, and it is, as we shall presently see, strongly supported by the Reports of the official inspectors, that no accident occurs of which it may not be said, that proper precautions—involving, probably, a considerable outlay—would have prevented it. On the larger and bolder operations the Railway Commissioners say in their Report for 1848, 'All who have had occasion to consider the state of our knowledge with respect to the strength of materials are aware, that a multitude of experiments, and the investigations of scientific men, have established the laws on which the relation between the several dimensions of beams of different materials, their stiffness, and their ultimate strength depends, when exposed to an action not differing in an important degree from a steady load. The experiments necessary for the investigation of this subject were within the means of the individuals who had leisure and inclination to make them; and before our present knowledge was attained, numerous structures, which have existed through long periods, afforded a variety of examples for the guidance of engineers. The failure also of works exposed to the action of weights at rest, or moving with comparatively small velocities, was gradual, and not likely to endanger the lives of individuals without some warning of their insecurity. But the last few years have rendered necessary the construction of a number of bridges, intended for the use of heavy trains passing at great speeds, in designing which the known laws relating to the strength of materials are most probably inapplicable; while the experiments requisite to ascertain those which may be

' applicable are beyond the means of individuals to make, and
' the highest degree of science will probably be required in
' combining the results of any experiments bearing on the
' subject. Neither can the solution of the question be left to
' time, or to the experience which might be obtained of a
' number of sudden and frightful accidents; the knowledge is
' required at once, for the guidance of engineers who may have
' to design or improve such works, of which a great number are
' likely to be constructed within a short period.'

But it has not been in general from the bold and original experiments of celebrated engineers that the public have suffered. Men so high in their profession feel the responsibility of power, and the risk to which professional character may be exposed by mischievous blunders. It is in the subordinate and simple operations left to ignorant and irresponsible people unwatched and unknown, that danger lurks. A welding has been carelessly finished. A bar or a girder has an internal crack, caused perhaps by sudden expansion or contraction in its manufacture. Through such latent causes, in the midst of a general feeling of security, the infinitesimal overstrain severs the parts, and a crash follows, (as lately in Gracechurch Street,) of which all the realm hears with commiserating horror. Among the other sources of danger believed to be inscrutable, it used to be stated in scientific evidence, that such internal defects in the materials used in connexion with railways were not discoverable. The public were disabused of this notion when they found that every piece of iron to be subjected to a possible strain in the construction of the Crystal Palace, was to be tested by the hydraulic press.

Three formidable accidents reported by the Commissioners of 1850, were caused by fractures where the metal was found porous and crystalline. The history of the girder of a bridge near Gainsborough, which snapped and tilted an engine-waggon into the road beneath, is instructive. Captain Wynne, the inspector, said, 'After examining the bridge, I thought it desirable to
' inquire into the history of the girder, from its casting to its
' leaving the foundry; I therefore requested the attendance of
' Mr. Farmer, at whose foundry it was cast. He informed me
' that he kept an ironmonger's shop; that he was unacquainted
' with a founder's business, and that he entrusted all to his fore-
' man, who had worked formerly in some large foundry. I
' therefore sent for the foreman, and he informed me that he had
' been employed in the Phœnix Works at Sheffield; that the
' castings there were confined to machinery, and that he never
' had been engaged in a casting of the same magnitude as the

'girder.' I then visited the foundry, which proved to be a very 'small affair, in very confined premises.' On farther inquiry he found, that several attempts had been made before even *so* successful an effort was accomplished; but that there had been all along differences of opinion about the sufficiency of the girder, and that 'there is one up now still more imperfect.'* The result of the investigation is, that the Commissioners '*hope* that the Directors will see the propriety of adopting precautions for the 'safety of the public,' &c.

The railway companies, in their litigations with parties claiming damages for injury caused by accident, strongly endeavoured to carry as a point of law, the principle that they were not responsible for the consequences of these 'latent defects' as they were called; but their liability fortunately was sustained. It is not sufficient, however, that the courts, both civil and criminal, are open in case of injury: the public should be protected from risk. But the adoption of preconstituted securities for the sufficiency of materials 'would be 'expensive.' Certainly; and here we are driven back on the axiom with which we started, that the safety of life is the first thing to be provided for. For a decrease of the 20,000 annual deaths by violence, we must look to the statistical classification of the causes of these deaths; and seek to induce the Legislature to take peremptory protective measures against each operative cause,—however much it may embarrass the probable investment of capital or the amount of dividends. It is admitted, that in most of the affairs of life the people of this country require less central interference than those of any other European nation. This may be true, even of railway travelling. The general safety, considering how slight is the governmental control over the powerful corporations entitled to make their profits by conveying passengers and goods in the cheapest manner, is even at present most remarkable. The number of passengers killed was 30 in 1847, 21 in 1848, 23 in 1849, and 32 in 1850. So small a proportion of deaths levied on the travelling community shows that what the companies require is not so much control as regulation. A more effective check on carelessness or parsimony, and a closer responsibility, might reduce the number of accidents nearly to zero. In the meantime we have no hold on companies to prevent them from gambling with the public safety. In other words, though they are pecuniarily responsible for injuries caused by carelessness or defectiveness, and though they know that when any

* Report of Commissioners of Railways, 1850, p. 65.

flagrant calamity occurs, their line will be for a time deserted, they have it in their power to run risks involving both the lives of the passengers and their own fortunes, in sanguine reliance on the chapter of accidents turning up in their favour, — and we know that they have persevered in doing so.

The Reports of the Railway Commissioners are filled with expostulations to the companies to abandon practices fraught with danger, such as have come under the notice of the inspector from their being of a kind which have occasioned fatal accidents. For instance, when the train went off the rails at Rockliffe, on the Caledonian line, and killed five people, besides doing much secondary mischief, it was found that the whole had been caused by the defective construction of a fixture on a wheel. It would surely be no extravagant interference with freedom of action and the rights of property, to make it penal to employ a wheel of so dangerous a construction. The Railway Board, however, could only gently report that ‘it appeared to the inspecting officer that the wheel had been improperly fitted in the first instance in the manufactory; and as a great number of wheels fixed in a similar manner were in daily use upon railways, and the accident had occurred on this wheel after it had travelled from 12,000 to 13,000 miles, the Commissioners caused a circular to be sent to the Railway Companies calling attention to the remarks of the inspecting officer upon the advisability of an examination of all wheels so fixed, and the adoption of measures to prevent a similar catastrophe.’ Yet, if any company chose to disregard this representation, and for the sake of present economy, to take the chance of a similar catastrophe, there appears to be no law subjecting the managing partners to responsibility by punishment as criminals, for this wholesale gambling with human life. People may differ on the propriety of making directors criminally responsible, at least until they are fully warned, and defy the warning. But surely when death has occurred, and scientific authorities point out the distinct cause of it, there should be summary means of interference. It is not enough, that railway servants are punishable by the criminal law for any neglect of duty, according to the nature of the case. A stricter protection of the public requires that some person should be authorised to see that there are no latent sources of danger in the materials or machinery and the general arrangements. Most recent accidents on railways bring home the cause to an insufficient staff of skilled *employés*, and to a dangerous economy overtaking the capacity of subordinate officers. Thus in the alarming accident at Cowairs, near Glasgow, several people were

killed from palpable deficiency of service and caution; yet no one was penally responsible; since the subordinate officers who were tried could not be punished for mere failure to do impossibilities; and their superiors, who were well scolded by the bench, had, in lowering their establishment to so fatal a pitch, committed no crime punishable by law. The public will never feel at ease while their safety depends on the discretion of inferior and uneducated officers, with too a heavy an amount of duty economised on their shoulders. A collision occurred on the Leeds and Thirsk line in September, 1849; and it appeared from the report of Captain Simmons that, while eleven passenger trains passed the spot daily, there were two goods trains, concerning which the principal regulations were, — that, ‘the goods guards must endeavour to work their trains so as not to impede passenger trains,’ and ‘a goods, mineral, or ballast train, when likely to be overtaken by a passenger train, shall shunt at least fifteen minutes before the passenger train is due, and wait there five minutes after the passenger train is past.’ Thus, the safety of every traveller on that line depended on the discretion of the guards of those goods trains, who no doubt for their own safety would ‘*endeavour* to work their trains so as not to impede passenger trains,’ though perhaps they might sometimes find it a perilous kind of pilotage; and would also shunt ‘when likely to be overtaken by a passenger train,’ provided they knew distinctly when there was such a likelihood. In fact, the accident was occasioned by the guard of a goods train being utterly ignorant whether the passenger train was due or not. This seems a tempting of Providence as it is called,—rather a defying. Captain Simmons naturally suggested,—nothing beyond a suggestion could come from the Railway Board,—that there should be fixed arrangements on the line, ‘so that the drivers and guards should be relieved from the undue responsibility now attached to them, in starting on a journey with no instructions as to the getting out of the way of passenger trains beyond the above-quoted regulations, and a printed passenger time-table.’

The accounts of fifty separate accidents in the last Commissioners’ Report (some of them already referred to) show a remarkable generic similarity in the causes at work: the same deficiencies uniformly repeating themselves, with little perceptible difference except that the amount of slaughter varies with the number of victims present at the time. A succinct tabular statement of these accidents and their causes might, one should think, be prepared to good purpose, and be widely distributed especially among railway servants. Some companies would not like this, as it must show the men how great a proportion of cases arises from ex-

cessive parsimony and an insufficient establishment. It would also show, how often the most respectable and painstaking officers are the victims of these defects. However unpleasant or humiliating such a record might be, it could not but be of service. This system has indeed been partially commenced by the Railway Board in the transmission of circular notices on the prevalent causes of accident. Thus, having had to examine four successive accidents caused by the explosion of the boiler, a circular was sent to the several companies, which ran thus:—

‘The Commissioners are informed that these occurrences all receive a very probable solution; and the facts connected with them tend to establish that the water in the boilers had been allowed, either by accident or neglect, to diminish, so as to leave the top of the fire-box uncovered, and therefore liable to acquire a great heat from the continued action of the fire. Under these circumstances, the supply of water has been increased, or, from other causes, it has accumulated at the fire-box end of the boiler, so as to flow over the heated plate. This action would produce a very rapid evaporation; and it is probable that it has been so rapid and to such an extent, that neither the escape of steam through the cylinders nor the safety-valves has been sufficient to relieve the pressure suddenly produced in the boiler; and explosion has taken place.’

The two most fatal accidents which have latterly appalled the public—that of Cowlairs, near Glasgow, and that of the Sutton or Frodsham Tunnel,—are both, in their operative causes, typified by similar minor accidents, which might have been, but fortunately were not, equally fatal,—and, like them, are traceable to defective and parsimonious arrangements. At Cowlairs an engine was to pass from the front, cross, and get to the back of a train. The nearest crossing point was shut by the carriages of this train—the next by another train. The driver of the latter was requested to move back and open the crossing. He politely did so. One cannot help speculating how his passengers would have felt in the consciousness that this little accommodation exposed them for a couple of minutes to about as much danger as the soldiers who defended Hougemont at Waterloo. The end of the train stretched beyond the signal-post. It was but two minutes exposed, but that was enough; another train coming up with unconscious rapidity, dashed into it. The precaution, which would have averted the collision, was the sending a man back with a hand signal; but there was no one to do this duty. In fact, the few officers present,—the break-headsman, guard, and engineman,—had a fearful press of business and responsibility thrown on them; and they found themselves

without definite instructions, under circumstances, for which, indeed, they had not sufficient official strength, however fully they might have been instructed. It would seem, from the inspector's Report, that the driver wished a pointsman to take a signal, but the man said he had other things to do. 'He then directed his fireman to go and tell the guard to go back with a signal. . . . Whilst the fireman was in the act of going to tell the guard to go back, the train drawn by Brown's engine came in sight from around the curve,' and the crash took place. Could any jury convict the driver, who had asked, first, the pointsman, and then the fireman to tell the guard to go with a signal; or the pointsman, who had other things to do; or the fireman, who could not find the guard in an instant; or the guard, who was not told; or even the driver of the advancing train, who, in unconscious security, was coming up very fast? This tragedy occurred in August, 1850. Within two months we find the same story repeated, in everything but its bloody conclusion; and this was averted only by the peculiar skill and carefulness of the driver of the assaulting train. At Woodlesford, on the Midland line, an excursion train was detained. The weather was foggy, and the train stretched 160 yards beyond the signal; being thus unprotected by it, when another train came up. The driver was proceeding with extreme caution, and the collision was slight; but it might have been more deadly even than that of Cowlairs.

On the 15th July, 1850, a train entered the Blackheath tunnel of the North Kent line, of which the cavernous progress is thus described by the Government inspector: — 'The load proved too great for the engine on so steep an incline, and with such slippery rails. The train, too, owing to the previous delays, commenced the ascent at a very slow pace, when it wanted all the momentum of accumulated speed to carry it up the incline. The engine had only got a few yards inside the tunnel when the driving wheels began to slip, and soon the speed was so much reduced, that the fireman jumped off, and walked beside the engine shovelling up sand upon the wet rails, to enable the driving-wheels to bite, the engine having a sand-box only on one side.' Thus was it slowly labouring through the tunnel, when a passenger train ran into it. The Blackheath tunnel, therefore, would have anticipated the terrible catastrophe at Sutton, but for a material element of difference. Instead of human beings, the train broken in upon was freighted with fruit for Covent Garden Market. Sutton has left scars on the public mind too deep to be soon forgotten; and some of our readers will remember the identity

of the principal cause of the crash with that which we have just been describing. There were others, it is true, in the Sutton case, to make the tragedy more complete. Not only was the engine insufficient to bite the slippery rails, but defects in the carriages acted as a drag. The policemen usually stationed by the tunnel mouths were withdrawn at a time (the races) when they were specially needed; and the trains, instead of having a systematic precedence, were despatched as fast as they could be filled—filled extravagantly beyond the locomotive strength of the engines, as had been represented to be the case by the responsible officers of the company—the slowest happening to be sent off first. Yet, in his analysis of the causes of the previous accident at Blackheath, the Government inspector had embodied what, if it had been put into the shape of an order, and had been enforceable, instead of being a mere expression of opinion, would have guarded against the recurrence of this particular form of destructiveness, of which so fearful a repetition was to recur. The inspector said, ‘The causes of this accident are at once apparent, namely—1st, the insufficiency of engine power, there having been only one pilot engine stationed at Woolwich. 2ndly, the imperfect rules laid down for working the traffic through the tunnel. 3rdly, the neglect of the guard of the fruit train in leaving Strood without his fog-signals, and in not at once procuring others from the driver when he found that his train was delayed.’

A general review of many reported railway accidents convinces us that a code for merely punishing stipendiary officers is not sufficient protection to the public. There must be something nearer an adoption of the *obsta principiis*. Unpunctuality is a main cause of accident;—an unpunctuality created by imperfect, because parsimonious, organisation. Subordinates, who would act most faithfully under distinct regulations and have a right to expect them for their guidance, are driven to rely on their own discretion; and instead of mere obedience to orders, a fund of individual resources seems to be taken for granted, such as one might be thankful for in effective commanders of armies. Those who are best trained to formal duties, are sometimes the worst fitted for emerging efforts of presence of mind and forethought. What should be as regular as the motions of the clock becomes an entanglement and confusion of persons and machinery, on the sudden aspect of danger and death. The station-master or pointsman has his instructions for acting according to a certain routine of trains; but the routine is not followed; and instead of acting on his instructions, he has to make, on the instant, a new arrangement,

* of which he cannot calculate the results, and with which he cannot get his fellow-officers to co-operate. There is something pathetic in that part of the official Report on the Sutton accident, which describes the efforts of the guard of the fourth train to take a signal to the mouth of the tunnel. After passing the impediments in the tunnel, and beginning to run, he 'had only got back a very short distance, when he heard 'the noise of another engine approaching.' The man's nerves had been very much shaken by the unusual circumstances under which he was called upon to act. Upon hearing the engine apparently quite close to him, while the darkness prevented his seeing any thing beyond the reach of his own small lamp, he completely lost his presence of mind and fell over the ballast in the centre of the tunnel: and there he lay all the time the last train was passing by him, as he himself relates, in such a state of excitement and fear, that he was scarcely conscious of any thing which occurred. In one case described by the Commissioners in their Report for 1850, the station-keeper had no clock or watch, but he took his time from the passing of a particular train; and that train being, on one occasion unpunctual, put him wrong, and a collision was the consequence. To the causes of accident already mentioned we must add badly framed and insufficient instructions, together with an imperfect supply of the minor machinery for a line—such as breaks and signals, and perhaps guards, as seems from what passed lately before the Lewes inquest. Among the multiform origins of railway evils neither last nor least, is the practice of permitting rules to be habitually neglected until some crash reminds the directors and superior officers of their existence.

All these with other latent causes of death are in perpetual operation, and the question still remains—how are we to be protected from them? The power and wealth of the railway corporations have, we all know, made Government loth to interfere with them; but the public now loudly demands increased protection—and it must be given. As we have already said, we do not anticipate that absolute control will be necessary, or the penal punishment of directors for either carelessness or culpable parsimony. It is too clear, however, that penal consequences to culpable officers, though coupled with pecuniary loss to shareholders, are but poor protection. Perhaps the example set by the factories and mining acts may be followed; and, in case of a stringent and minute system of inspection being adopted, to make it criminal in directors to continue any arrangement condemned as dangerous by the proper officer, might be as much security as the subject admits of.

Hitherto we have looked to the position of the passengers only; but they are not the only persons slain or maimed by railway trains. The companies collectively, and individually every company not in desperate circumstances, have a strong pecuniary interest in the safety of passengers; for, every fatal accident brings after it a collapse of passenger fares. But even this interest, which has been found insufficient to secure the highest degree of care, is wanting, (except as far as Lord Campbell's act creates it,) in the case of the public at large. It is the pecuniary interest of companies to carry their lines through all convenient levels, inhabited or not, leaving it to the public to take care of themselves. Thus we have annually a formidable item of railway accidents in 'trespassers and other persons, neither passengers nor servants of the company;' among whom the slaughter in 1847 was returned as 57; in 1848 as 43; in 1849 as 52; and, in 1850, 48. These numbers represent, in a great measure, victims deliberately offered up to the cheap construction of railways. Level crossings are less costly than bridges or tunnels, and they are sanctioned at so many lives a year. It would, we think, have been a good rule from the commencement, and one of which the cost would have been well repaid to the public in its sense of security and ease of mind, had all railways been, as it were, hermetically sealed, so as to render trespassing in them next to impossible.

There is yet another and a very heavy item of vital responsibility to be laid at the door of railway companies. How do they provide for the safety of their own servants? It is among these that we find the great preponderance of fatalities. Thus there were slain in 1847, 124; in 1848, 138; in 1849, 127; and, in 1850, 128. We cannot doubt that much of this sacrifice of life could be avoided by the adoption of precautionary arrangements at a slight increase of outlay. Here, however, is opened up a vista of other transactions, where life in the labouring class has certainly been far more wantonly wasted than is at present the case in the working of our railways. The attention of the public was strongly directed, a few years ago, by Mr. Chadwick, to the inconsiderate selfishness of contractors for railway cuttings and other like works, in tempting their ignorant servants to put their lives in peril. In a parliamentary inquiry which followed, some witnesses startled the committee by their candour. Reference was made to the use of copper stemmers, instead of iron, for ramming home the powder for blasts; and the expediency of the substitution was supported by such instances as this:—'William Jackson, miner;—He was looking over John Webb's shoulder while he was stem-

‘ming a hole charged with powder, when the blast went off, ‘blowing the stemmer through Jackson’s head, and killed him ‘on the spot.’ An assistant engineer on the Sheffield and Manchester Railway—there is no occasion to give his name—being questioned about his own practice in this matter, said, ‘When I inquired into the thing, I found so very few indeed “were the accidents that occurred in consequence of the iron ‘stemmers which we used, that I did not think it worth while ‘to cause the whole system to be altered, and go to the expense ‘of such tools;’ which elicited from the querist the remark, ‘You thought on the part of the company, that it was worth ‘while running the risk of two or three men’s lives rather than ‘going to the expense of more expensive tools.’ The same gentleman’s examination on the use of ‘the patent fuse’ was still more candidly characteristic. ‘In blasting in this tunnel ‘was the patent fuse used?’—‘No.’ ‘Is that not more safe ‘for blasting than the common fuse?’—‘Perhaps it is; but it is ‘attended with much loss of time, and the difference is so very ‘small. *I would not recommend the loss of time for all the extra ‘lives it would save.*’ His unsophisticated ideas as to the worth of human life seem to have almost amused the Committee. Being asked, ‘How many deaths were incurred by accident during ‘the construction of the tunnel?’ he answered, ‘Mr. Nicholson ‘states twenty-six. I think it may be possible—one or two ‘more or less—somewhere thereabouts.’*

This gentleman appears to have been a rigid performer of his duty; and his duty was to blast rocks, not to save men’s lives; which, at the rate of twenty-six per tunnel, more or less, he seems to have looked on as a trifling affair. Conscientious fulfilment of defined duties is one of the national virtues; and the engineer’s zeal for his own department only points to the propriety of what we have already hinted at,—separate provisions for insuring the safety of life at whatever cost, and their enforcement by persons whose special duty it shall be to carry them out. Many are the important things left undone, which will be done well if we can show them to be any one’s special duty or function; but which will be neglected for ever while we can only speak of ultimate results. The nurse to whom sanitary reformers might plead for ever about the dangerous effects of her treatment of her own offspring, will do careful justice to the child she is employed to tend, not because

* Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on Railway Labourers (1846). Questions 1592, 1609, 1629.

she loves it better than her own, but because she has stipulated to bestow on it a certain attention, and so made this her bounden charge. A great change was produced in the health of emigrants by bargaining with the medical superintendents of the vessels for so much per head, not according to the number embarked, but the number landed. It has been said that the increase in the health and vitality of the exiles which followed this arrangement, represented merely the mercenary motive. We hope, however, that it is not a refinement to think it partly owing to a more precise declaration, and a better adjustment of the obligation contracted for. In the one case the surgeon might conceive his duty to be satisfied by attending to the passengers when they were ill and prescribing medicines for them; in the other, the proviso which made it his interest must have also shown him it was his duty to keep them alive, if possible, and, for this end, to keep them in health.

The Legislature of late years has in some measure carried out the object of this paper in the case of manufactories, emigrant vessels, and mines. In the last department, however, there is vast room still for further amendment; and if it do not soon come from the quarters more nearly interested, we should neither be surprised nor grieved to see that the country, impatient and indignant at the perpetually recurring slaughters in these dusky caverns, should angrily demand of the masters, 'for whom did 'scethe a thousand men in troubles rude and dark,' an account of the blood spilt to make their fortunes. Mining workmen, like mariners, are reckless fatalists. But it is clear, that those who ought, in some measure, to rule their destinies, have not yet, in many instances, taken the first step towards the fulfilment of this duty by recording and classifying the character and causes of the several fatalities. Mr. Blackwell, in his Report on the Ventilation of Mines, presented to Parliament in 1850, says, 'The returns ' which can be obtained with respect to the number, nature, and causes of accidents in mines, I have found to be in general so exceedingly vague and defective, that any conclusions based on them would be liable to error. With very few exceptions no accounts at all are kept at mining establishments on the subject. If accurate registers were to be found at such works of the accidents of every class which occur, along with the information which might be rendered of their causes, nature, and results, a source of very important knowledge and correct conclusions would be afforded.' Mankind have too long appeared much of Serjeant Kite's opinion, when he pleaded that his recruit had no visible means of subsistence, 'because he is a miner, and works ' underground.' The class are so far severed, socially and phy-

sically, from the rest of the world, that they are far from obtaining their fair proportion of our sympathies. But, independently of higher considerations, the world is now too enlightened to require being told that it is unsafe to possess a class in our population, reckless of their lives, and, consequently, of the duties for which men should desire to live.* The Select Committee appointed by the House of Commons in 1835, to inquire into Accidents in Mines, reported tenderly on the conflicting claims of pecuniary profit and human life. After referring to the fact that, since the Davy lamps had been introduced, accidents had rather increased than diminished, — because coal was now worked under circumstances of danger in which it would never have been ventured on before; — ‘These facts,’ they add, ‘led your Committee to a serious part of their inquiry — how are these calamities to be prevented for the future? They desire fully to recognise the undoubted rights of property, enterprise, and labour. They acknowledge their conviction that the public interest has been served by the opening of the more dangerous mines, and the competition their working has created; they do not overlook the anxious care alleged to have been maintained to diminish the attendant risk; but *they deem it their duty to state their decided opinion, that the interests of humanity demand consideration; and they would gladly put it to the owners of these mines, how far any object of pecuniary interest or personal gain, or even the assumed advantages of public competition, can justify the continued exposure of men and boys in situations where science and mechanical skill have failed in providing anything like adequate protection.*’

We now treat such questions more boldly. In the last session of Parliament was passed the act already alluded to ‘for Inspection of Coal Mines in Great Britain.’† Some such

* It is an instructive fact, that in Scotland colliers were slaves down to so late a period as the year 1775; and part of that selfishness, which coerced their services for the wealth of their owners, has ever (though it may be decreasing) tinged the connexion between employer and employed in this large department of useful labour. So little better off were the coal districts in England, that the Pretender is said to have reckoned, in ’45, on a rising round Newcastle. The Legislature were extremely unwilling to do anything which would touch the profits of the miner, though, in 1846, a Committee of the Commons reported that, during the past twenty-five years, there had been at least 2,070 deaths from explosions, and that the mortality was then proceeding at the rate of 100 a year.

† 13 and 14 Vict. c. 100.

measure could not be delayed much longer. These subterraneous workshops had forced themselves into notice; though the doors were closed against inquiry. The Commissioners on the Employment of Children in 1842, reported of North Durham and Northumberland:—‘In this district the sub-commissioner experienced unusual difficulty in obtaining an approximation to the true number of the accidents. In general, the medical men connected with the collieries either directly refused to give any evidence on the subject, or evaded inquiry: while, at the collieries, the persons whose office and employment rendered them best acquainted with the facts, were equally reluctant to afford information.’ In other districts a similar callous neglect was indicated by such scraps of evidence as these,—Mr. Thomas Bishop, overseer at Polkemmet, testified: ‘We have no record of accidents; nor is it customary to keep such, not even of accidental and sudden deaths.’ So, another witness, whose brother had been killed and ‘brought home coffined:’—‘No one came to inquire how he was killed—they never do in this place.’ Dr. Alison, of Edinburgh, said, ‘I am pretty sure about fifty people under my care, and connected with collieries, have lost their lives in consequence of accidents occurring in the works around Tranent; and I do not remember of an investigation having been made by the sheriff in more than one instance.’* The act of 1850, which requires a return to be made to the Home Office, and in Scotland to the Crown Prosecutor, of every fatal accident within twenty-four hours after it occurs, coupled with the authorised system of inspection, may be expected to remove this dismal obscurity. It is most important to notice in these Reports how many of the minor accidents which cause individual deaths may be obviated, if it be the interest and the desire of the person in charge to obviate them. This is not the proper place for an inquiry into the respective merits of the ‘buddy,’ or contract, and the ‘doggy,’ or stipendiary system of management: but the information on which Mr. Tancred, in the ‘First Report of the Midland Mining Commissioners,’ supports the latter against the former, contains strong evidence of the extent to which dangers are avoided by a conscientious system. Thus: ‘As to the imputation against the buddies, of recklessness in exposing workmen to danger for their own interests, there is the direct evidence of a coalowner, who does not himself employ buddies, exemplified by what I have seen in his own pit:’ and then he quotes the evidence of Mr. Raybould: ‘Buddies force men into

* Commons’ Papers, 1842, xv. 450.

' danger sometimes, so that I am sure our system is much safer. You saw the coals which were ready cut to come down as soon as the spurns are cut away. Now sometimes the coal in the night will have "given token," i.e. shows it is ready to come down, and then is very dangerous. Now our doggy goes the first thing of a morning to examine all the coal before any man is allowed to enter, and he can tell in a moment if the coal has given token, by rapping it, and, in that case, he has it thrown with the greatest caution. This cannot be made piece-work by the butties, so it is done by them in the cheapest way; they set men to do it for 1s. or 1s. 6d., and they do it in the readiest way, and throw their lives away.' A working witness drew his distinctions in his own way: 'After a fall of coal, it's worse than a field of battle full of soldiers to be forced to go to draw the coals before it's settled and made secure; and perhaps the doggies (*qu.* butties) will say, "Go in, we must have these coals drawn out." That man you were with in our pit is as worthy a man as ever trod in shoe leather, and would not put a man to work in a place he did not know was safe, for anything.'*

In one sense it cannot be said that the state of the miners is neglected by the members of the Legislature in this country. Reports on their condition are voluminous enough; it has been more written on than the privileges of the peerage. The great difficulty has been to communicate a feeling of responsibility to those who have immediate control over them. Perhaps this may be effected by the arrangements we have just been considering for inspection and for the reporting of accidents. Since, for factories, at all events, we have no doubt that the inspection system has done much to reduce the sickening array of horrid calamities, falling chiefly on children, and arising from a gross sacrifice of their safety to a miserable economy. The difficulty, which the factory inspectors sometimes experience in getting dangerous machines effectually protected, is a painful proof of the necessity of the partial control exercised by them. We find, for instance, in the latest Reports some instructive incidents connected with the cleansing of blowing-machines in cotton-mills. A blowing-machine, or scutcher, is used for cleaning cotton previous to the first manufacturing process. It may be described as a radius of blunt knives, revolving so rapidly as to make 1600 revolutions in a minute. Its extreme velocity makes it appear quite innocent; while, of course, it is only the more instantaneously destructive to any portion of human flesh coming in

contact with it. The working of it is at the same time so simple, that the rawest hands are set to it; and thus it not unfrequently happened that the country youth, before he had a week's experience at the mill, had his arm torn off by the shoulder. The beater, or radius, works in a case; but the risk of accident arises from the necessity of cleansing it or removing obstructions; and there are holes in the case, through which the arm may be inserted for this purpose. Of course even the most ignorant person will not touch the beater when in gearing; the accidents have generally occurred from ignorance that the momentum acquired makes the wheel revolve after it is disconnected with the moving power. The remedy suggested by the inspector of factories was to report 'as dangerous any blowing-machine with a beater, which can be reached by the hand through any opening, not having a cross-lid door, or other covering, secured under lock; the key being in the custody of the manager, overlooker, or other competent person; so that the beater shall not be reached by the hand while revolving.' This arrangement was resisted by those employers who think there is a legitimate profit in danger. They maintained that the works would be needlessly obstructed by it; but it obtained the sanction of eminent machine-makers. In one instance, where the inspector had served a notice to lock a blowing-machine, he received the following answer from the mill-owner: 'If the markets do not improve, I shall not only lock the scutchers up, but the mill also; and if any of the humanity-mongers wish to take it, I shall be glad to let it.'* Soon afterwards there appeared in the surgical Report of the district, in reference to this very machine, the following entry. It related to a young woman:—'Fracture of the radius and ulna of the left arm. Her arm was struck by the beater of a scutching-machine. She was attempting to clean the beater before it had stopped,' &c. From some incomprehensible reason, on the penalty of the act being pursued for in this case, the justices did not levy it; but the same Report of the factory inspector which mentions this, gives satisfactory testimony to the penalty being levied in other instances.

With gregarious employment in manufactories, another department of our subject—the proper structure of edifices—is intimately connected.

The fall of a large mill at Manchester in 1824, which, crashing floor after floor, involved the slaughter of a large number

* Half-yearly Report of Inspector of Factories, October, 1849, p. 32.

of work-people, was attributed by the newspapers to a flaw in the iron-work; and much dissatisfaction prevailed at the time in consequence of all investigation into the cause of the calamity being suppressed, the coroner's jury returning a general verdict merely of accidental death. When a similar crash occurred at Oldham in 1845, killing twenty people, and maiming many others, the Government, with great propriety, appointed a commission to report upon it. It was shown, that the fracture of one of the iron beams would bring down a huge fabric just like a house of cards, (the very words in which a bystander described the late accident in Gracechurch Street): The Commissioners reported, 'Upon a careful examination of fragments of the beam, we find the iron employed to be of fair average quality; but portions of the beams are of that unequal crystallisation of parts — (the central portions of the longitudinal sections being more highly crystallised and of larger grain than the external)—which points to a much quicker cooling of such external parts than of the internal: and we also observed cracks of an order apparently in like manner due to an unequal cooling of the mass, whence unequal contraction and separation of parts ensued.*' It was further shown, that this was directly caused by an economising practice of removing the iron red-hot from the sand, contrary to the view laid down by an eminent mechanician; who said, 'From my own experience I am satisfied that fire-proof beams should never remain less than ten hours in the sand after they are cast; and for heavy castings thirty or forty hours, or more, are sometimes necessary to assist nature in a perfect, and consequently a strong and compact process of crystallisation.' But this is a troublesome, and therefore an expensive process; and as the quickly-cooled bar, with the element of slaughter hidden in it, looks as well and as secure, it is sent out to do its work.

Thus we see, in a country of large and daring operations such as ours, in how many shapes death lurks under mere insufficiency of workmanship. Whenever it is developed by any great calamity, a proclamation is issued by all concerned, calling on the public to believe it an inevitable and inexplicable fatality,—'a visitation of Providence;'—the materials were all-sufficient;—every thing was done in the best and most efficient manner;—every official person did his duty, and something more. The good-natured press and the better-natured public, after a slight murmur of indignation, undergo a reaction and accept the vindication. Sometimes a bold front

* Commons' Papers, 1845, vol. xvi. p. 547.

is shown, and it is held that, if cause and effect had been really at work, the calamity which has happened is the very one that was most fully guarded against. Thus, on the occasion of a late fatal colliery explosion, so perfect it was said was the system of ventilation in the mine, that, had the calamity not occurred, a model of the works was to have been sent to the Great Exhibition! Meantime, scientific inspection has done much to clear away this false mist; and though the interested parties fight against cause and effect to the last, science always triumphs.

There is one consolation on looking back to the series of defects to which we have thought it necessary to draw a desultory attention;—it is, that we are on the way forward. A time, not quite forgotten, existed, when, for the continuance of slavery and the slave-trade, it was considered a sufficient argument in this country,—as it still is in some others,—that on these conditions only could sugar, tobacco, and cotton be produced at an eminently remunerating price,—that this could not be accomplished with free labour; in short, that the practice ‘paid.’ To risk the lives and limbs of human beings for profitable or economically conducted operations, is but a modification of the same principle—a modification which, thanks to our ever-advancing civilisation, is fast dwindling away. The more scrupulously we abstain from tampering with Freedom of Trade, properly understood, the more fully are we entitled to insist on the observance of every condition necessary to the protection of the life or health or morality of the public. If these conditions cannot be complied with, without enlarging the law of criminal omissions and enforcing a severer superintendence over rash and negligent offences in the performance of otherwise lawful acts, there can be no question of the course, which a good citizen and a public-spirited legislature should pursue: *Odor lucri ex re quâlibet non est bonus.*

ART. V.—*Tales and Traditions of Hungary.* By FRANCIS and THERESA PULSZKY. Three volumes. London: 1851.

WE are disposed, on many accounts, to pay more attention to these ‘*Tales and Traditions of Hungary*’ than we generally bestow upon the annual harvest of foreign or domestic fiction. They are the productions of a land still very imperfectly known even to travelled Englishmen, and they exhibit national and social features of much interest, ere the latter were dimmed and disordered by revolutionary convulsions. The

Tales themselves are remarkably well written, and evince a command over our language, not always found even in novelists 'to the manner born and bred.' They add something also to our legendary lore; but they are even more attractive as proofs — and they are not the only proofs afforded by their accomplished authors — of the resolute heart and purpose with which the Hungarian exiles in this country are striving, we trust successfully, to soothe their sorrows and alleviate their privations.

Our sentiments upon the causes and the issues of the late Hungarian Revolution were unreservedly expressed at the time: and we now allude to them, only for the sake of briefly re-affirming them. In the subsequent policy of Austria towards the kingdom, so unfortunately for itself, leagued with the imperial crown, we have seen nothing to commend, nor any reason to hope, that for the future Vienna will learn wisdom, or Hungary subservience from the struggle. On the contrary, instead of two crowns federally connected, we have now before us the melancholy spectacle of one nation suppressed by violence, and of another degraded by breach of faith, and sinking into an abyss of debt, which must sooner or later end in irretrievable insolvency. Hungary may be, like Poland, effaced from the list of independent kingdoms; but Austria is no less blotted out from her place among the independent nations of Europe. For a while enormous armies may sustain her, as the legions of Rome sustained the decaying Empire. For a while loans, monopolies, and commercial restrictions, may fill over the yawning gulf in her exchequer. But, virtually, the imperial eagle has become a 'tame villatic fowl,' and must stoop to the lure of the Russian fowler, whenever his policy or his pleasure prompt him to reclaim her.

Our business, however, is with the past rather than the present. In one respect, these volumes have disappointed us. We had expected more legendary and mythical treasures from the border-land of Eastern Europe. Limitary districts, from Teviotdale to Rajahstan the seat of lingering wars and mingled races, have generally been the favourite haunts of popular tradition. But either the Hungarian mind is not actively creative or susceptible, or the great waves of legend had passed into Central Europe ere the Magyars established themselves on the plains of the Theiss and the Danube: for the most stirring and picturesque of the traditions selected by Mr. Pulszky are not of home-growth, but are either modified or imported from other lands. Thus we have tales of German, Jewish, and Slovak origin; we have a Magyar version, and not an improved one, of Cinderella; and in 'Jack the Horse-dealer' we

unexpectedly encounter an old and valued acquaintance from North Britain. The general spirit and gracefulness of these stories indeed compensate, in some measure, for their want of originality; and the admixture of foreign elements is explained by the fact, that Hungary, like the Dorian States in Greece, was a *congeries* of many races under the supremacy of a single clan.

The Magyar element, indeed, predominant as it was in the camp and the council-chamber, was at no period the most potent or popular ingredient of the national mind. Song, myth, and local superstitions have been, in all ages and countries, quite as much the property of the subject, as of the dominant race. Not Dorians, but Achæans, furnished the staple of the Greek Epos and Drama; the conquered British race consoled itself with the lays of the Round Table; and the Saxon, when, in his turn, he was oppressed by the Norman, soothed his griefs by chaunting the exploits of Hereward and Robin Hood. Spain, indeed, which, in other respects, has so often run contrary to the European current of civilisation, presents a contrast in its ballads also. They were the songs of the victors, and breathe all the fierce bigotry of religious triumph. Yet, even in Spain, the bards of Valladolid borrowed much of their minstrelsy from the infidel poets of Granadâ, and the lays of the champions of the cross were often merely echoes of Moslem inspiration.

Poor, however, comparatively as Hungary seems to be in indigenous legends, it is, or at least it has been, until very lately, singularly rich in many of the elements which render chronicles picturesque and romance instructive. To the artist, whether he employs the pen or the pencil, permanence is dearer than progression. The broad daylight of our rapidly moving age is less grateful to his eye than the shadows of more stationary and more tranquil eras. Goethe pronounced a cotton mill in full work the greatest poem he had ever seen; yet his *Faust* was constructed, not out of the suggestions or accompaniments of spinning-jennies, but out of the most august and widely-diffused myth of the Middle Ages. Hungary, cager as it long has been for progress, has been also remarkably faithful to the past in its social aspect. Although in the heart of a continent, its intellectual position, since the days of the good Matthias Corvinus, has been almost insular; and in its deep seclusion the land of the Magyars has cherished the fashions of the age of Wallenstein. On the very brink of the late revolution her national character and relations resembled those of England in 1640 more than any of the social phases of Western Europe in 1848. At the beginning

of the present century few European travellers had penetrated into Hungary further than Pesth; and the educated Hungarian rarely travelled at all, except as a soldier, or secretary of legation. The language of the Magyars, which is completely Asiatic in its structure, has been a further cause of their isolation from the rest of Europe. A portion of the class of Magnates, indeed, since the period when Maria Theresa drew their ancestors to her court by the double magnet of wealthy Austrian heiresses, and honorary Austrian decorations, has resided almost entirely at Vienna, and affected to deride the barbarous manners of their countrymen. But the nation itself was little influenced by the example of a few courtiers; and to be termed an Austrian was deemed a pointed insult to a Hungarian gentleman. Nor were even the great towns and provincial capitals favourite residences of the native aristocracy. From their Asiatic ancestors, as well as from the semi-feudal pomp which surrounded them in their castles and manors, they had imbibed an earnest passion for country life. They were active magistrates, agriculturists, and sportsmen. They dwelt in the midst of their tenantry. They were splendid and ceremonious in their retinues and their banquets. A marriage, or a funeral, would at times collect a small army of mounted and gaily-clad retainers. They were supreme judges in the county-courts, and general arbiters in all local controversies. They were as jealous of crown lawyers, as the early Christians of pagan tribunals; and they disdained the courtiers much as our Jacobite squires used to disdain St. James's and the partisans of the House of Hanover. Manners and opinions descended, with little change, from sire to son; and in the remoter districts old fashions were mingled with the oriental and patriarchal habits of the original followers of Duke Arpad.

Accordingly Hungary retained, long after the western provinces of Europe had lost them, many of the social characteristics which poets and artists delight in representing. Of these different pictorial elements, as well as of the many sublime and pastoral features which his native land presents, Mr. Pulszky has fully availed himself in his '*Tales and Traditions*;' and his sketches of manners which are gradually becoming obsolete in Hungary, invest his narratives with a charm, which many readers will accept as an equivalent for a more indigenous and poetic originality. They reflect in lively colours the lineaments of the various races which compose the kingdom of Hungary; and they have afforded us in reading them a pleasure similar to that, with which we study a picture by Vandyke or

an episode in Clarendon. The English country gentleman, whom the civil war in 1642 drove first into camps, and afterwards into exile, is no distant type of the Hungarian noble whom the revolution of 1848 hurried from his broad domains, and has since consigned to banishment on the banks of the Thames or the Potomac. The resemblance between the men who sacrificed themselves for Charles Stuart, and the men who responded to the appeals of Kossuth, can scarcely fail to have its due effect with the English reader in rendering Mr. Pulszky's volumes popular.

In collecting and arranging his 'Tales and Traditions,' Mr. Pulszky has had especial reference to the eras and peculiarities of Hungarian society. The first three stories are intended to delineate three distinct phases of national life. In the 'Baron's Daughter' we have the contrast between the nobleman attached to the court, and the proud allodial proprietor who disdains to hold his property as a fief from the king. The legal antiquary will recall in this story the recurring feud, both in Frankish and Saxon annals, between the territorial noble and the noble by office and creation. The second story turns upon the opposition between the burghers and the manorial lords; and in the proposed *mésalliance* between a landed spendthrift and the buxom heiress of a fashionable and wealthy tailor, it exemplifies the changes which trade was gradually introducing into society. In the third story, 'the Slovak Legend of Yanoshik,' the common robber appears as the avenger of social injustice; and, after the approved morality of Robin Hood and Rob Roy, levies black mail on the wealthy, in order to relieve the wants of the poor. The following tales in the first of the three volumes are less systematically connected with one another, or with the aspects of national life. Many of them are meant to illustrate the poetical and traditional feelings of the different races in Hungary; and some of the legends scarcely belong to Hungary at all, but have been admitted into the collection merely on account of their popularity at home or their intrinsic merit.

The traditions of Hungary are, however, confined to the first of the three volumes; the second and third are devoted to a tale of modern date. The alleged conspiracy for which Martinovitch, abbot of Sasvár, and his friends suffered death upon the scaffold in 1794 is the groundwork of Mr. Pulszky's story, 'The Jacobins in Hungary.' It is not difficult to discover that portions of this tale are records of the Austrian system of governing by division and espionage at the present hour; and that the fate of Bathyani and the other illustrious victims of '49 is described and deplored under the mask of grief and in-

dignation at earlier atrocities. Mr. Pulszky's feelings have, however, betrayed him into no political intemperance, while they add much force and pathos to his narrative. The plot of *Martinovitch* would, in the hands of most novelists, have afforded a fair pretext for the regular three volumes; and the author of the '*Jacobins in Hungary*' has, by his conciseness, set both publishers and writers an excellent example. Mr. Pulszky does not detain the reader by descriptions of fine or wet days, of sunsets or moonlight on the waters, or the furniture of halls and boudoirs, but tells his story in an earnest, rapid, and business-like fashion. The connexion, indeed, between the first and the following volumes is not very obvious; and we should have preferred a total separation of the traditions from the tale. We could also have gladly welcomed a few more rhythmical legends, like that of '*Yanosh the Hero*,' which is so gracefully chanted in blank verse by Madame Pulszky. This story is, indeed, in our opinion, the most striking and genial of the entire series; and as some readers are inclined to 'skip' verses which are imbedded in prose, we will attempt, by a brief analysis, to show that '*Yanosh*' is a new acquaintance well worth being introduced into England.

The groundwork of the mythical '*Yanosh*' is the *obsitos*, or hussar on furlough. This has always been a very popular character with the Hungarian peasantry. After ten—often after twenty—years' absence in garrison or in foreign lands, the hussar returns to the village where he was born. He is welcomed in every hut; his proper realm, however, is the public-house. There he enjoys, not merely 'his hour's import-ance,' but a species of martial apotheosis. Enthroned in an elbow-chair, and with his pipe and wine-jug before him, he is the oracle, the geographer, and general gazetteer of the admiring villagers. Something of a Bobadil indeed he is, especially 'after the operation,' as Mercutio phrases it, 'of the third cup.' His stories are interminable, and extremely fabulous. His chorography is as exact as Gulliver's. He has been in the land of the dog-headed Tartars. His narrative would entitle him to a place in Lucian's treatise '*De Verâ Historiâ*.' He took Napoleon prisoner at Leipsig: but then he was wondrous pitiful, and let him go again because the empress Maria Louisa wept so bitterly. By the same token, the empress gave him her own golden watch, which he would gladly have exhibited to his friends and kinsfolk, had it not passed into the hands of certain Jews. Of Italy he remembers only the intense cold and the huge rosemary bushes. Of France he has not much more to tell, beyond his having fought with the inhabi-

tants thereof, because they had robbed their king of his crown. But on his march to France—and his cups are now nearer the number of the Muses than of the Graces—‘he passed the Alps, and saw that they reached up to the moon, so that he was able to caress her jolly face.’ But at this point of his story apparently some sceptical person begins to cross-question the *obsitos*, in a dialogue, very like some of Hans Andersen’s:—

“What then did the moon do when you kissed her jolly face?”

“Saucy lad,” interrupts the greybeard; “she complacently purred like a cat.”

“He proceeds to describe how he got farther and farther to the very last end of the world.

“And what did you do there?” inquires a pert little girl.

“Well, I sat down on the brink of the world, and swung my feet over the boundless *nothing*.”

“And have you not likewise been up to heaven, Bacsí?” is again inquired.

“To be sure, I was there once.”

“Goodness me, how pleasant that must have been! Certainly, up above, there is no need to work, and food and wine are in plenty.”

“Silly boy,” retorts the old hussar; “there is work enough. The stars have to be cleaned all day long with chalk and spirits, so that in the evening when they are hung up, they may shine brilliantly, and there is little rest for the soldier, as the old saints have all double sentinels at their doors. But the temple of St. Peter! *that* is the largest building all over the earth, and far prettier than anything I knew in heaven.” He continues; “when we were commanded there to the church parade, we were obliged to keep two days of rest, before we could get from the gate to the chief altar.”

The ‘cleaning the stars with chalk and spirits’ is not a mere flight of fancy in the *obsitos*, but a memento typical of his greatest grievance while in active service,—that, namely, of being daily compelled to polish his regimental buttons, and keep them as bright as mirrors. The irksomeness of this duty he can never forget. It haunts his dreams and troubles his banquets.

The hero Yanosh is a mythical hussar. He rises from the peasant to the soldier, passes through a labyrinth of strange adventure, and ends his career by becoming the king of fairyland. Madame Pulszky has adopted the modern version of this story by Alexander Petöfy—a youthful poet who, in 1848, fought for his country and sang its glory: ‘but, since the last ‘unfortunate battles in Transylvania, he has disappeared: his ‘fate is unknown.’ Petöfy’s poem is written in four-lined stanzas of Alexandrians—‘a measure well adapted in the Hungarian language for popular tales.’ The English translation is in blank verse, which metre Madame Pulszky adopted ‘in

'order not to be diverted by the exigencies of rhyme from 'following the original exactly.' The following is a brief outline of the adventures of Yanosh:—Yanosh or Yantshe, that is, John or Jack, is a shepherd whose cattle graze on the village common. He loves and is beloved by a fair maiden named Ilush, who is servant of all work to a cruel stepmother. Yantshe, having been making love instead of minding his business, loses the best part of his herd, and is 'pitchforked' off the premises by his wrathful master. Mr. John, after performing a doleful serenade under Ilush's window, leaves her to the nevercal mercies, and becomes a wanderer over the face of the earth. A storm, which is very powerfully described, drives him for shelter to a cottage tenanted by a gang of robbers. The robbers insist that he shall either die or join the band. Yantshe adroitly eludes the alternative: drinks his churlish and dishonest hosts under the table, and burns their house about their ears.

After this good deliverance, he 'wanders again over hill and 'dale,' and at length falls in with a troop of hussars, who accept him as a recruit. They are bound for the realm of France, where they are particularly wanted, as 'the miscreant 'Turk' has not merely laid waste the kingdom, but also carried off the king's daughter. Yet, considering the urgent need of the allied forces, their line of march is somewhat circuitous; for they first visit the dog-headed Tartars, who prove to be very worthy folk, Italy, and India! On arriving, however, Yantshe does 'yeoman's service: he rescues the French princess and makes a hideous slaughter of the Turks. In requital the king of France proposes to abdicate in Yantshe's favour, and to give him, moreover, 'his fair daughter to wife.' But the hero declines both proffers, telling His Most Christian Majesty, that 'If the 'dear Ilush cannot be mine . . . I will possess no other in this 'world.' Whereupon, the king treats Yantshe as handsomely as Alcinous of yore treated Ulysses. He gives him store of gold out of his treasury and puts him on board a ship with orders to convey him to Hungary—Hungary, in those days, having, like Bohemia in Shakspeare's, a sea-port. The vessel sailed with a favourable wind; but one evening, when hero John, like pious Æneas, was standing on deck, watching 'a host of red-legged 'storks above him in the clouds,' . . . the mate predicted foul weather: and on the morning his prediction was so completely verified that Yantshe is washed ashore, but his gold and his ship and comrades disappear for ever. Fortunately, like Ulysses again, he is stranded on his own coast, and on a part not very far from the cottage where Ilush dwells. But here his luck, for the present, ends; for Ilush is in her grave, 'done to death'

by her cruel stepmother. Yantshe plucks a rose-bud from her tomb, and sets forth again 'to wander to the limits of the world.'

He arrives in Giant-land, and finds its king at dinner with his fifty sons. They are far better than the giants of ancient Britain in our *Jack's* days, inasmuch as they eat, neither Englishmen nor other men, but—rocks. The giant monarch helps Hungary John to a slice of granite. Our hero, naturally resenting such hard fare, yet not altogether warrantably we think, knocks his Majesty on the head with his dinner, and then most unexpectedly finds he has succeeded to all the paternal rights and titles, and that the fifty youthful giants have become his vassals. Next he comes upon a witch-sabbath, and discovers among that unhalloved crew the wicked step-mother of Ilush. He steals their broomsticks; summons, by a few notes of his deceased host's whistle, his fifty giant-vassals; and has the satisfaction of a witch-battue, and of seeing the 'injusta noverca' hurled through the air into Hungary, where the villagers, next morning,

'Find her dead

In Yantshe's native village, on the turf;

And no one mourned the wicked woman's fate.'

After this signal service to society, hero John comes to the *endless ocean*, beyond which lies Fairy-land. One of his obedient giants carries him across, and after landing, and slaying in three successive days—this being the favourite number in Hungarian legend—three lions, three bears, and a dreadful dragon, he becomes free of the country, bathes in the Lake of Life, and by the same immersion, the rose-bud from the tomb becomes Ilush herself:

'The fairy maids admired her all, and soon
Elected her their Queen; the fairy boys
Proclaimed the hero king; and in this isle,
With his Ilush, up to this day, John lives,
The happy ruler of the Fairy-land.

We have dwelt more especially upon the legend of 'Yanosh' the Hero, because it appears to us the best representative in Madai Pulszky's collection of the life of the Hungarian peasant, and of the turn of his imagination. It is scarcely necessary to point out the affinity between that poem and the Arabian tale. Indeed, nearly all the elder Hungarian traditions have in them a tinge of orientalism. We have already indicated also more than one parallelism between 'Yanosh' and the *Odyssey*—the most Asiatic in its character of the Hellenic lays. The reader who is versed in legendary lore will easily discover many other features in common with the cycle of European myths. An imaginative mind of Hungary would

seem to be eclectic in its character, and to delight less in inventing than in expanding or adorning the traditions of other nations. Its eclectic tendency may probably be ascribed, on the one hand, to the late introduction of the Magyars into Europe, and, on the other, to the variety of races which occupy the land of Hungary Proper. We have found, however, among Mr. Pulszky's traditions no traces of a story which was long supposed indigenous in Hungary,—the story of the Vampyre. Their once troublesome and terrible neighbours, the Tartars, play, of course, no unimportant part in the traditions of the Hungarians. Prior, to say nothing of other authorities, has made us all acquainted with the dread inspired by their name, and the solid and sanguinary fashion of their diet.* But, until we read Mr. Pulszky's book, we do not remember to have met with a reversal of the adage, 'Catching a Tartar.' 'The Poor Tartar' might have been entitled 'The Tartar Caught.' The legend is as follows:—

'When in the tenth century, the Tartars, led by their chief, Batu Khan, invaded Hungary, and King Bela was forced to flee from the disastrous battle at Sajó, despair seized upon the Hungarians. Many had fallen on the field, still more were butchered by the faithless enemy; some sought escape, others apathetically awaited their fate. Amongst these was a nobleman, who lived retired on his property, distant from every high road. He possessed fine herds, stately horses, rich corn fields, and a well-stocked house, built but recently for the reception of his wife, who now for two years had been its mistress.

'The disheartening account of the general misfortune had reached this secluded shelter, and its peaceful lord was horrified. He trembled at every sound, at every step; he found his meals less savoury. His very sleep was troubled; he often sighed, and seemed quite lost and wretched. Thus anxiously anticipating the days to come, he sat at his well-closed window, when suddenly a Tartar on his steed galloped into the court. The Hungarian bounced from his seat, ran to meet his guest, and said:

"Tartar, thou art my lord: I am thy servant: all thou seest is thine. Take what thou fanciest; I do not oppose thy power; command, thy servant obeys."

'The Tartar impatiently sprang from his horse, entered the house, and cast a careless glance on all the precious objects around. His eye was fascinated by the brilliant beauty of the lady of the house, who appeared tastefully attired to greet him here, not less graciously than her consort had in the court below.

* Was ever Tartar fierce or cruel
Upon the strength of water gruel
But who shall stand his rage or force,
If first he rides, then eats his horse?

'The Tartar seized her without a moment's hesitation, and, unheeding of her shrieks, swung himself upon his saddle, and spurred away, carrying off his lovely booty.

'All this was but an instant's work; the nobleman was thunder-struck, yet he recovered, and hastened to the gate. He could hardly still distinguish the Tartar galloping in the distance, and bearing away the lady fair.

'Her consort heaved a sigh, and exclaimed with deep commiseration: "Alas! poor Tartar!"'

Madame Pulszky concludes her portion of these volumes with a very lively and instructive account of the 'Outlaws,' or, as they are often denominated, the 'Poor Lads of Hungary.' The robber is a personage who appears in almost every Hungarian tale. The traveller seldom sees him; but he hears of him at every post-house; for the inn-keepers are always well provided with tales of highwaymen, to detain their customers at night or to induce them to take an escort in the day-time. The Austrian conscription, combined with the reluctance of the peasant to pass the best years of his life in the garrisons of Italy, Galicia, or the German provinces, materially contributes to recruit these roving bands. Deserters, unjust serving men, and fugitives from the police, betake themselves to the woods and marshes, and enjoy a precarious freedom at the expense of the farmers and the manorial aristocracy. There is, however, considerable difference between the races, both in their sense of 'meum and tuum,' and as regards the kind and the degree of the offences which they commit. The German colonists in the Saxonland of Transylvania, in the free towns, and the northern county of Zipsen, are the most rigid respecters of property. Murder and arson are seldom heard of among them, and it is gratifying to learn that they are the best educated and most frugal of the 'nationalities.' The Jews are the accredited receivers of stolen goods, as well as the chief harbourers of thieves; for which offices they are especially fitted by their avocations as publicans and wandering pedlars. But the most active and subtle of thieves is the Gipsy. He is, indeed, a practical Communist, and has inherited from his earliest ancestors the maxim which he so punctiliously observes, '*La propriété c'est le vol.*' For crimes of deeper die,—murder, arson, and robbery with violence,—the swarthy Slovaks of the South are in bad odour; and the Wallach rivals even the Corsican in the shrewdness, the patience, and the energy with which he accomplishes his *vendetta*.

The Hungarian occupies a midway station in the statistics of crime. He is rarely a sneaking thief, and as rarely a burglar.

or a deliberate assassin. On the other hand, he is addicted to arson, and frequently commits manslaughter in the frays of the tavern. But his absorbing passion is horse-stealing. His nomadic blood is stirred irresistibly at the sight of a handsome horse or a stately bull. The following anecdote strikingly illustrates the propensity of the Hungarians to cattle-lifting. Indeed, Willie of Westburnflat and the heroes of Teviotdale would have found themselves quite at home in the Hungarian borderland.

'About twenty years ago, Mr. Borbély, a wealthy man, was noted in the country for his eccentricities. He was fond of meddling in the county elections, and once rode from the county of Szabolos, with two hundred peasant-nobles, to an election in the county of Beregh, where his companions had the right of suffrage. Arrived at the frontiers of the county, on the borders of Tisza, he stopped, and said:

"My noble brethren! we are proceeding to a constitutional solemnity in Beregh: we are to exercise there the greatest privilege of nobility, the right to elect a representative for the diet, and we must be mindful to behave in a manner becoming our station. We shall there see many horses, many oxen; handsome oxen. Let, therefore, every one of us well consult his conscience, and closely examine whether he is able to resist temptation: it is yet time. Whoever does not feel himself strong enough to subdue every inclination to weakness, may step forth and return. We stand now on the boundary, but as soon as we have crossed the Tisza, we are in the neighbouring county; and it would be a cruel shame if fewer of us were to return than have set out, and if several of our number should remain behind in the county-house, not upstairs in the great county-hall as guests, but below in the gaol, shut up as thieves. Consider, noble brethren*, and decide."

'It was a picturesque sight. Borbély in red attire, cut in the peasant's fashion, with the drawn sword in his hand, rode on a roan horse: a white feather flowed on his broadly rimmed black felt hat. Around him were assembled two hundred peasants of Szabolos, all adorned with similar white feathers, their party sign: and in their rear halted forty cars, from which they had descended to approach their leader, and listen to his discourse. When he had ended, they thunderingly cheered him; but two of them left the ranks, and declared they doubted whether they could resist temptation, and therefore preferred to return. Borbély loudly praised their conscientiousness, gave each of them ten shillings for his journey back, and led his other virtuous heroes over the Tisza. His speech had

* The peasant-nobles (freeholders) are always addressed by the higher classes of nobility with the words 'noble brethren.' One feature in common with many others, between the Magyars and the Roman burghers, who accosted one another as '*celsi Ramnes*.'

the wished-for results, and his noble brethren decided the election without getting into any collision with the county justice of Beregh.'

We must now conclude our notice of these very interesting volumes. We have confined our remarks to the strictly Hungarian portion of them, and have very probably passed over some stories which may seem to our readers more attractive even than those we have cited or analysed. For this cause we have omitted the German tale of the Free Shot — a distant cousin of our well-known acquaintance 'Der Freischütz;' the Slovak story of the 'Golden Cross of Körösfő,' which is a variety of an Arabian fable, 'The Buried Palace;' The Jewish tales, which are incorporated in the Talmud; and 'Pan Twardowsky,' which, in an abbreviated form, had already found its way into England and been illustrated by George Cruikshank. Our limits, on the other hand, have compelled us to abstain from abridging the beautiful story of 'Klingsohr of Hungary,' and the indigenous tale of 'Monastir,' a Magyar version of the classical legend of the Spear of Achilles, which at once caused wounds and cured them. The same reason has withheld us entirely from touching upon Mr. Pulszky's 'Jacobins in Hungary,' which, however, its intrinsic merits will sufficiently commend to the reader.

Had these volumes been the result of lettered ease, or the harvest of studious and observant travel, we should have found much to attract us in them. But our interest in their contents is much enhanced by the circumstance of their being the fruits of exile. In the act of composing or collecting these 'songs of home in a strange land,' countless associations and recollections must have thronged upon their gifted authors, and rendered their labours a renewal of sorrows. Scenes which they may never revisit, and friends from whom sounding seas and shores, or inexorable death have divided them for ever, must here have once more passed before them in shadowy succession. The sympathy of a nation, with whom their own countrymen have so much in common, we are confident, will not fail them: and while we cordially welcome the present volumes as meet companions to Grimm and Auerbach, we cannot but congratulate ourselves that the English language has been made the receptacle of these gleanings from the 'Tales and Traditions' of the Magyars.

ART. VI. — 1. *Letters to John Bull, Esquire, on Affairs connected with his Landed Property, and the Persons who live thereon.* By Sir EDWARD BULWER LYTTON, Bart. Eighth edition.

2. *A Letter to His Grace the Duke of Bedford, on the Prospects of Agriculture.* By W. W. WHITMORE, Esquire.

LORD STANLEY has told us, what many of his party have repeated, in language too plain to be misunderstood, that, although the cause of Protection is hopeless during the continuance of the current Parliament, there may yet be hopes of returning to the House of Commons at the next election, a Protectionist majority numerous enough to reverse the present Free-trade policy; that it will then be practicable to impose, in favour of the British farmer, moderate import duties upon agricultural produce, so as to check the downward tendency of prices, and thus enable tenant farmers to conduct their business with an adequate profit. The actual state of parties, as shown by recent parliamentary divisions, imparts some appearance of probability to this expectation of a change of Ministry, at a no very distant day. And as a dissolution of Parliament would accompany or immediately follow a change of Ministry, many of those who believe in its approach are preparing themselves for the coming combat at the hustings; and are consequently putting forth appeals to such constituencies as are supposed likely to prefer men pledged to increase, by legislative measures, the price of the produce which they raise.

Among these anglers for agricultural votes is to be found one who was once counted on the side of the Free Traders. Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton is a gentleman who has undeniable pretensions to take his seat among our legislators. Since he last enjoyed that honour, he has become a considerable landowner, and it is understood to be his present ambition—a very natural one—to represent in Parliament the county in which his property is situated, comprising a constituency whose interests are thought to be bound up with those of the order to which he now belongs. The conversion to their ranks of a man of note, such as Sir Edward Lytton, is an event of some importance to the advocates of Protection, who may fairly expect that it will be followed by further accessions to their numbers. For, it is only reasonable in them to suppose, that he cannot have been gained over to their cause save by cogent reasons; and that many others who may not have before bestowed sufficient independent attention on the controversy, will be led to give to his

conversion a weight which would be denied to the opinions of a meaner advocate. In the absence of any similar apprehension, we did not think it necessary to notice the 'Sophisms of Free Trade,' notwithstanding the numerous editions through which that volume passed.

Having most carefully examined the three letters which Sir Edward has lately published on the subject, we confess that we cannot see in them any arguments which have not been again and again disposed of, or which, proceeding from any writer of less account, would have appeared deserving of further refutation. But, for the reasons already given, it seems desirable at this time, and at the risk of being accused of again slaying the slain, to notice and to controvert the facts and reasonings through the aid of which Sir Edward seeks to justify his abandonment of the Free-trade cause.

While gladly bearing witness to the moderation of language with which he has assailed his former opinions,—a spirit not always found in political adversaries, and especially among recent converts,—we must be allowed to express our mortification that, at the outset of his argument, Sir Edward has allowed himself to cast a slur upon the efforts of society to provide more adequate means of education for the masses of our population. To see in a country squire, bred up to consider fox-hunting as the first of social pursuits, a fear of imparting knowledge to the people, lest they should be above the performance of menial services, would not in the least surprise us; but that an accomplished author, whose successful object it has been for so many years to enlighten the higher classes, should enrol himself among the obscurantists of the lower, does excite in us feelings of very deep regret. Is it possible that Sir Edward can be ignorant, that the facts, which he has derived from the tables of M. Guerry, in favour of the comparative innocence of the illiterate, have been most satisfactorily explained? and that, when they are considered (as statistical facts should always be considered) in all their circumstances, they prove the very reverse of the conclusion to which by inference he would lead his readers? M. Guerry has indeed shown 'that in those departments of France, in which the average of education is highest, it is found almost invariably, that crimes against both life and property are the most relatively numerous;' but Sir Edward has omitted to tell us, that in these same departments, crimes are for the most part committed by persons from whom all instruction has been withheld,—a consequence which seems to lie upon the very surface; since it is precisely in well educated communities that the ignorant would find themselves at the

greatest disadvantage in the competition for honest employments, and where they would consequently be most tempted to criminal courses. The districts where instruction abounds are, besides, precisely those districts where property abounds also, and where, consequently, crimes against property will naturally be most abundant. We confess that the inference to be drawn from the fact as stated by Sir Edward is one which we were not prepared to find him conceding to the prejudices of the vulgar; and we are the more surprised and grieved to encounter him among the fauteur of these prejudices, because we cannot comprehend how the fallacy, which he is thus instrumental in advancing, is in anywise helpful to his argument in favour of Protection.

The fallacy next brought forward in these letters is, that it is the interest connected with the owning and occupation of land 'which supports the bulk of our poor, which maintains the clergy, and defrays the costs that uphold civilisation in rural districts.' Now it will not be difficult to show that, not only is there no truth in this position, but that, as respects the support of the poor, it is the very reverse of the truth. If it ever was true, that time has long since passed away. From a period which reaches back beyond the experience of most persons now living, it may be safely asserted, that to the wealth of towns, and the employment which that wealth has given to labour, the landed interest has been indebted for relief from burdens to an incalculable extent. It was shown by the census of 1841, that the number of persons employed in agricultural labour was less absolutely, and, of course, less proportionally, then, than in 1831. The natural increase of the population is always greater in the country than in towns, by reason of the greater longevity attained in country districts, and the larger proportional number of children born in them, who are reared: and as, in this kingdom, where the land has long been fully occupied, there is no room for further employment in cultivating the soil, while the tendency of improvements in the processes of agriculture is rather to lessen than to add to the demand for agricultural labour on any given area, the fact of a decrease in our agricultural population, as proved by the census of 1841, scarcely needed that confirmation, but might have been assumed from the very nature of the case. Let our landowners, who are so clamorous for legislative protection, by means of import duties upon corn, reflect a little upon the consequences to themselves of any effective interference which should counteract this tendency; and it is difficult to imagine that they should not see how fatal it must be,—at least in this point of view,—to their true interests. A duty upon imported grain can only be supposed to benefit the

British landowner by limiting the quantity imported; for if the same number of quarters should find their way to our markets, it needs no argument to show that the price of home-grown corn would not be increased by the duty, since it is the relation of supply to demand which alone regulates prices.* Of course, however, the quantity imported would be limited, for it could no longer answer to the foreign grower to supply us, if, out of the market price which satisfied him when his produce came in free, he should find his net returns diminished through having to pay a duty. If, as our Protectionists would have us believe is always the case, it is the foreigner and not the consumer who pays the duty, and who thus is made to contribute towards our public revenue, what benefit to the agricultural class would arise from this? It would, indeed, prove advantageous to the country at large, could the foreigner thus be brought to relieve us, in any sensible degree, from taxation; but where is the man in his senses who imagines for a moment that any one save the consumer, pays the tax upon that which he uses? If the tax does not add to the price, how can its imposition benefit the home producer, and if it does add to the price, by whom is that addition paid, save by those who are forced to give that higher price?

It is clear, therefore, that an import duty, to have any effect in the direction sought by the advocates of Protection, must limit the supply, must raise the price, must diminish the foreign trade of the country, and must lessen the accumulation of capital, together consequently, with the demand for labour in the towns. What is then to become of the individuals who form the natural increase of the population in country districts? Where are they to find the means of supporting themselves? During all the years in which Protection existed, there were no such means furnished save in the towns; and so inadequately were those means then furnished, compared with what has been experienced since Protection was removed, that the poor-rates, which it is wrongly asserted are principally paid by the farmer, were greatly higher at that period, than they have been since the beginning of 1849. What other reason for this fact can be assigned than that, through the repeal of the Corn-law and the all but free admission of foreign grain, the springs of industry throughout the country have been so far relieved, that employment has been found for a greater number of the people than was possible under the restrictive system? Let the advocates for the restoration of that system but succeed in their endeavours, let the manufacturing industry of the kingdom receive the serious check which they would thus give to it, and where are the surplus inhabitants of

the rural districts to betake themselves? They must remain at home in a condition of hopeless pauperism; the whole of these districts must be converted into great pauper warrens; and the farmer, finding himself, as it were, eaten up by the crowds around him, who in this case will be reduced to forced idleness, would be no longer able to pay rent or to hold his position in society.

Besides, it is an error to assert that the land supports the bulk of the poor. The proportion in which land contributes to that support is every year being lessened through the increase and prosperity of the towns, the rateable property in which is constantly and rapidly augmenting in value. Thus in every way is relief practically extended to the land, by the very means which those who own and occupy the land are seeking to destroy. Even at present the contributions of land to the purposes in question, are not beyond nine twentieths of the whole sum assessed; while real property of other kinds is now so rapidly increasing, that we may fairly expect in a very few years to see the land assessed for less than one third of the sum actually needed. At the same time, this entire sum, through the rapid accumulation of capital, under the more natural system to which we have now reverted,—an accumulation greatly beyond the increase of our population,—will be lessened, not merely with relation to our means of bearing the burden, but positively. Sir Edward brings forward an extract from the evidence of a farmer, who was examined before the Committee of the House of Lords, on the burdens affecting land, which sat in 1846; and he evidently thinks that it greatly strengthens his case. The quotation is as follows:—‘The poor-rates on Mr. Heathcoat’s factory in this parish, have averaged 41*l.* 0*s.* 9*d.* a year, for the last seven years; on the farm occupied by myself, 58*l.* 2*s.*; so that I have paid 17*l.* 1*s.* 3*d.* a year more than Mr. Heathcoat. My rental is 300*l.* a year, and the profits you can imagine; Mr. Heathcoat’s profits are reputed to be 40,000*l.* a year!’ It would be well to inquire from what amount of poor-rates this farmer was relieved through the existence in his parish of a thriving manufactory, employing so much labour as could justify the estimate formed of the profits which it yielded: and, further, whether the 41*l.* 0*s.* 9*d.* a year paid by Mr. Heathcoat was not altogether called for by causes to which that gentleman did not contribute, but which flowed from the insufficient wages paid to labourers in agriculture, and to the operation of the laws affecting parish settlement;—which laws form, probably, a more fruitful source of expense to the occupier of land than any of the causes of which he is so prone to complain.

Sir Edward further asserts, that it is the land which maintains the clergy,—by land meaning landlords. In making this assertion, he presumes too much upon the want of knowledge of his readers. He surely does not question the fact that, as respects tithes, the Church has always been joint owner of the soil, and that the revenue which the parson (*persona ecclesiæ*) derives from the soil is as much his property *for the time being*, as the remaining nine tenths are the property of the lay landlord. Until the passing of the recent law for commuting tithes into a fixed money payment, a system of joint ownership, under which one party bore the whole expense of improvement, in the benefits of which the other party participated, was no doubt a very inconvenient system, and had a tendency to check improvement. This evil is now, however, for the most part, if not entirely, remedied; but, even while it continued in operation, the landowner had no just ground for claiming any compensation on that account from the rest of the community. He had inherited, or acquired, his land subject to the payment of tithes in kind, and was in so far only part-owner of the products of the soil; there could, therefore, be no justice in any legislation which should propose enabling him to draw from the rest of the community an equivalent for the remaining part, which never was his own.

In connexion with this branch of the subject, we must take occasion to ask, whether there be not another part of the usufruct of the land, beyond that belonging to the Church, to which the landowner has no ancient and, in strictness, no equitable claim? The *land-tax*, as assessed at the Revolution, and as succeeding to the subsidies of former times, amounts, in fact, to only a small remnant of the revenues which, until the Restoration, the Crown had retained for itself from the yearly value of estates held by its feudal tenants. About the year 1080, when the Domesday Book was compiled, all the great landholders met William the Norman at Sarum, and ‘submitted their lands to the yoke of military tenure, became the king’s vassals, and did homage and fealty to his person, obliging themselves to defend their lord’s territories and titles against all enemies, foreign and domestic.’ From that time, until the Stuarts were reinstated on the throne of Great Britain, more than 30 per cent. of the whole public taxation of the kingdom was borne directly by the land. For more than 100 years of that period no tax whatever was levied upon personal effects. Sir John Sinclair, in his ‘History of the Public Revenue,’ after describing the various payments exacted from landholders by the Crown, remarks, ‘Such was the heavy and complicated system of personal slavery, and of financial

'oppression, to which this country was subject, from the invasion of William the Norman until the restoration of the regal government in the year 1660. Fortunately, by 12 Car. 2. c. 24., the whole fabric was demolished at a blow; and it is now a matter of just astonishment how a nation who gloried in its freedom, and boasted of the mildness and benignity of its laws, could suffer itself to be loaded for so many centuries with a burden, which, notwithstanding some partial mitigations, seems to have been almost insupportable.' The forms in which this burden was imposed, and the irregularity of its incidence, constituted a special grievance; but the mere fiscal objection to it could only proceed on the ground of its partiality in favour of the industrial portions of the people. The fact, however, shows, that the real property of the kingdom was long held to be the source whence the public service should be provided; and, indeed, the complaint amounts to this, that it was a hardship to oblige a tenant, holding upon very advantageous terms, to pay rent for his land. During the time of the Commonwealth, viz. from Nov. 1640 to Nov. 1659, there was raised for public purposes the sum of 83,331,198*l.*, of which more than 59 millions consisted of land-tax, and sales of sequestered estates. On the restoration of Charles the Second the landowners took advantage of the power which they possessed in the Convention Parliament, to throw off entirely from their own shoulders the old feudal burdens of the State, and to shift them on shoulders less able to bear them. They passed a law absolving themselves from the payment of a rent-charge upon their lands, and levied instead a tax upon all the beer, ale, and other liquors sold in the kingdom; taking care, however, to reserve to themselves all the dues which they had been accustomed to receive from their copyholders. It would be well for our Protectionist landowners, if, when led to make complaint of the *peculiar burdens* placed upon the land, they would remember the *peculiar obligation* which has been thus removed from them, by proceedings of very questionable honesty on the part of their ancestors.

It forms but a weak argument in favour of protecting duties that they were established at the revolution of 1688, when this class of questions was but little understood, and when the possessors of land had it all their own way in Parliament. Sir Edward endeavours to make much of the fact, that, — an act having been passed in 1773 permitting the importation of wheat on the payment of 6*d.* per quarter, whenever the home price should be at or above 48*s.*, — this duty was raised as soon afterwards as 1791 to one more restrictive. What, however, does

history tell us was the real working of this more restrictive law? The scale it established was a duty on wheat of 24s. 3d. per quarter when the price should be under 50s.; of 2s. 6d. when the price should be between 50s. and 54s.; and of 6d. per quarter whenever the price exceeded 54s. At the date of its enactment, and for three years after, the supply of wheat of home growth was so abundant that we spared considerable quantities for exportation; but in 1795, there set in a cycle of bad harvests, and prices rose far beyond the rate at which importations could take place under the nominal duty of 6d., a state of things which continued throughout the war; so that the act of 1791 cannot be said to have been at any time in practical operation.

In answer to the assertion so constantly made, not only by Sir Edward Lytton, but by all who take up the same side of the question,—that low prices of food must act injuriously upon the labouring class by lowering wages,—we may point to the experience of the past two years, and not of those years only, but of every period when food has been abundant and therefore cheap throughout the kingdom. In every instance where this has occurred, the condition of the labourers, and especially of the farming labourers, has been one of comparative comfort. At various times since the introduction of that system of Corn-laws which began with 1815, and since the monopoly of the home market was secured to the native farmer either by actual prohibition until grain should reach a famine price, or by rates of duty nearly equivalent to prohibition, we have had a series of inquiries by Committees of either House of Parliament into the causes of Agricultural Distress; but in all these inquiries farming labourers were proved to be in possession of increased rather than diminished means. In 1847, by reason of the failure of the potato crop, and the consequent great demand for other descriptions of food, prices rose exorbitantly in comparison with the prices of immediately preceding years; the state of the independent labouring population, and especially of those employed in agriculture, became in consequence one of great trial, so that in many cases they found it impossible to live upon their earnings, and incurred debts for the absolute necessities of life. We have since had two years of Free Trade and moderate prices; and although these same labourers in agriculture have been forced in some counties to submit to a reduction of their money wages, their condition is improved notwithstanding; not only is their food more abundant, and their clothing more decent, than it had been in their power previously to command, but we know that they have been able to liquidate the debts which the necessities of 1847 had forced

them to incur. In all other descriptions of employment there has been no talk of reducing wages; quite the contrary,—to such an extent, indeed, that it needs no argument to show, that the condition of the working men must be most substantially bettered: And in the present state of information among them it is equally superfluous to say that ‘they know the reason why.’

It is doubtless the conviction of this fact which induces the advocates for ‘Protection to Agriculture’ to argue in favour of Protection also to other branches of industry. In this, however, they reckon without their host. The working men in our cities and seats of manufacture not only know the reason why they and their families are better fed and better clothed, and why they have less cause for anxiety lest employment should fail them; they also know, that no protective duties could be of the slightest benefit to them, but that, on the contrary, under a system which should limit the demands of foreign markets, they would have less certainty of employment,—that thus they might be driven to accept of lower wages, and with lighter purses have to meet the heavier demands of the baker. Neither is the great value of the home market, a point much insisted on by Protectionists, any secret to those whose industry is put in requisition to supply it: but they know also that this home market is never so extensive nor so good, as when the masses of their fellow countrymen, having abundant, and therefore, cheap supplies of food, have something to spare for other necessities as well as for some of the conveniences of life. Assuredly, the cause of Protection need not look for allies among the working classes of England.

In the endeavour to show the value of Protection to manufactures, Sir Edward has paraded a few sentences drawn from the writings of professed Free-traders, which he endeavours to pass off as admissions of the value of the system which they write to oppose. With this view, he has pressed into his service passages from Mr. Porter's work on ‘The Progress of the Nation,’ which, taken from their context, have the appearance of favouring the cause of Protection, but which, when read from the volume itself, have no such tendency. Sir Edward says (p. 24.), with reference to the exclusion of silk manufactures which was enforced until 1824,—‘What does Mr. Porter himself remark on this head? “By this prohibitory law, the English silk manufacturers were legally secured in the exclusive possession of the home market, from which, in the then imperfect condition of the manufacture, they would have been driven by the superior fabrics of foreign looms.”’ Sir Edward omits, however, the reasons which Mr. Porter assigns for this state of

things — viz., the heavy duties imposed on the importation of raw and thrown silk, and still more the want of all stimulus to improvement, by reason of such legal monopoly; and he omits to quote from the following page the statement that, through the withdrawal of this monopoly, and the improvements in the manufacture rendered necessary in consequence, English silks are now produced at prices and of qualities which enable us successfully to compete in foreign markets with goods produced abroad. Even the English farmer would be a better swimmer now, if he had never been incumbered with, — what must have always been to him unnecessary, — the aid of corks.

Other quotations respecting the cotton manufacture of France and Germany are made from the same author, and with about the same degree of candour. Using *per-centages* instead of actual quantities, Sir Edward would lead his readers to infer that the cotton manufacture under the system of strict protection in France has thriven in a greater degree than the same manufacture in Great Britain under that of freedom. For this purpose he selects the years between 1812 and 1826, and again between 1833 and 1843, and compares the increase during each of those periods in the respective countries. It so happens that in France the quantity consumed in 1812 was unusually low, and in 1826 as unusually high: the increase between the two years thus appears to be fifty-six millions of pounds. If an equal period of time had been selected only one year later — viz., between 1813 and 1837 — the increased quantity would have been forty-four millions of pounds, or twelve millions less. In England, between 1812 and 1826, the increase was above 101 millions of pounds. Next, during the ten years from 1833 to 1843, it is inferred that the French manufacturers gained upon their English competitors; but what is the fact? In France, the increase in weight of cotton used between those years was fifty-four millions of pounds, while in England during the same period it was 287 millions of pounds!

It is a favourite plea with the advocates of protecting duties, that by their means great branches of industry are fostered in a more backward country, until such a degree of skill has been acquired in them as will enable it to stand its ground against foreign competition. This is altogether a delusion. It would not be possible to point out any considerable branch of manufacture in any country, success in which is attributable to such a cause. Under this plea, however, the Government of France has hitherto succeeded in persuading the French nation, that it is for their ultimate advantage to pay for iron of home manufacture more than double the price for which they could

import it from abroad. M. Michel Chevalier, one of the ablest economists of the present day, a professor in the *Collège de France*, has computed, that since the peace of Paris, the direct loss thus sustained by the French people has amounted to 1,200 millions of francs, or forty-eight millions sterling; a sum which, if employed at common interest, would yield in perpetuity a revenue sufficient to buy, year by year in this country, a quantity of iron equal to the whole of that metal which, under the shadow of protecting duties amounting to 100% per cent., has been produced in France.

The common watch-word, or cuckoo-note, of the advocates of restriction in affairs of trade is, 'protection to native industry.' In the principle fairly involved in this motto we cordially agree. We are as anxious as the most vehement advocate for high import duties on foreign products can be, that the industry of our fellow countrymen should be protected. We only differ as to the means. Their theory of protection is, to guard against competition those branches of industry which, without such extraneous help, could never be successfully pursued: ours, is that of enlarging to the uttermost those other branches, for the prosecution of which our countrymen possess the greatest aptitude: and of thereby securing for their skill and capital the greatest possible return. This protection is best afforded by governments, when they leave without interference the productive industry of the country to find its true level; for we may be certain, that the interest of individuals will always lead them to prefer those pursuits which they find most gainful. There is, in fact, no mode of interference with entire freedom of action which must not be in some degree hurtful; but the mischief which follows upon legislation in affairs of trade in any given country is then most noxious, when it tends to foster branches of industry for which other countries have a greater aptitude.

As often as foreign productions are excluded from our markets, through the imposition of import duties, the effect must clearly be, to cause the consumers here to pay more dearly for productions of our own of the same description; while the producers of other articles which we have the means of producing more advantageously, are deprived of the protection which is naturally their due, by being thereby excluded from the markets they would otherwise find in return for the foreign articles which we are so studious to shut out. How, it may be asked, is a country to be profited by such an interference with the course of action which the nature of things has pointed out? A. can make in England for 20s., an article which he can sell in France for 25s., and B. can make in France an article for 20s., which he can sell in England

for 25*s.* It is clear that by this interchange both countries must profit, since neither France nor England would consent to pay 25*s.* to foreigners for that which they could make for less at home. But the English Government is seized with the desire of protecting English makers of the article which is more cheaply made in France, and places upon it a duty of 10*s.* In case, then, the English manufacturer can make this article for any price below the cost in France, *plus* the duty, he will have the monopoly of the supply in his own market, and will cause his countrymen to pay more dearly for it than if they had been left to deal with France. If the evil rested here it would be no trifling evil, but it does not rest here. France being deprived of an accustomed market for the sale of a given amount of its products, is no longer able to purchase the goods which used to be furnished by A., the English manufacturer. A. thus loses the profit which he had formerly gained; — for his ‘protection’ in the production and disposal of which he has a far juster claim than his fellow countryman, who can only carry on his monopoly trade by means of the sacrifices of his customers. It cannot be held that the trade thus unjustly fostered brings a greater amount of profit into the country than that from which Protection is thus withdrawn:—the very reverse of this is the fact. Neither can it be said, that those who are tempted through the virtual monopoly that has been created, to embark their capitals in a business which, without such restriction, could have no existence, are enabled to realise any rate of profit greater than that which, on the average, is realised in the country: since such a result would immediately attract further capital into the same business, by which the markets would be more abundantly supplied, and prices, and consequently profits, would be lowered. In this manner, what at best must prove a very evanescent advantage to a few individuals, is purchased at the cost of depriving an equal number of their fellow countrymen of the only ‘protection’ which in affairs of trade it is the province of a government to furnish; while the nation at large is impoverished by being made to pay more than it need have paid for that which it consumes. Examine as closely as you please into the history of any trade which is, according to the common meaning of the word ‘protected,’ and you will find that this is, and must be, the result.

It is surprising, that the opponents of Free Trade should allow themselves to fall into so obvious an error as the opinion which they usually take for granted,—that freedom of trade is identical with the total absence of customs’ duties. The only conditions necessary to the establishing of Free Trade are, first, that govern-

ments shall not impose restrictions which amount to a prohibition, either direct or virtual, on the importation or exportation of any article; and next, that no duty shall be imposed with the view of fostering home productions by means of the advantage given to them over goods of the same description when imported. In other words, that no duty shall be imposed save strictly for purposes of revenue. Import duties may, indeed, be so high as to act injuriously upon trade, by restricting consumption; but this, although unwise and subversive of the object legitimately aimed at by the imposition of duties, is still no interference with the principle of Free Trade. The changes in the sugar duties, now in progress, will be finally consummated in 1854, when one scale of duties will be chargeable on the article, without reference to the country of production. There will still remain rates of duty which will bring some millions yearly to the Exchequer; but we shall then have Free Trade in sugar, as perfect in respect of its economical principle, as if all duties on sugar were abolished. This, it is true, would not be the case if we omitted to charge with the same rate of duty any sugar which should be made from products grown within the kingdom. In tobacco we have Free Trade, although the duties charged upon the 'weed' are such as yield to the public revenue 4,300,000*l.* yearly, and although, for the protection of that revenue, and to avoid the evils of Excise regulations, we put restrictions upon the growth of the article at home.

Falling into the common misconception, Sir Edward Lytton remarks, 'But whether Free Trade be, in all cases, right or wrong, every one has allowed that we can't have it. To Free Trade, fairly and thoroughly carried out, there are more than fifty million obstacles to be found in the Budget.' And he thinks to fortify himself on this point by the following quotation from Adam Smith:—'To expect that the freedom of trade should ever be entirely restored to Great Britain, is as absurd as to expect that an Oceana or Utopia should ever be established in it.' If Sir Edward had read on a little farther and quoted the entire paragraph, he would have seen that Adam Smith was expressing, not his belief in the unreasonableness of a system of Free Trade, but his conviction of the mistaken selfishness of the men by whom it was sure to be opposed. We will supply the omission:—

'To expect, indeed, that the freedom of trade should ever be entirely restored in Great Britain, is as absurd as to expect that an Oceana or Utopia should ever be established in it. Not only the prejudices of the public, but what is much more unconquerable, the private interests of many individuals, irre-

‘sistibly oppose it. Were the officers of the army to oppose, with the same zeal and unanimity, any reduction in the number of forces, with which the master manufacturers set themselves against every law that is likely to increase the number of their rivals in the home market; were the former to animate their soldiers in the same manner as the latter inflame their workmen, to attack with violence and outrage the proposers of any such regulation; to attempt to reduce the army would be as dangerous as it has now become to attempt to diminish in any respect the monopoly which our manufacturers have obtained against us. This monopoly has so much increased the number of some particular tribes of them, that, like an overgrown standing army, they have become formidable to the government, and upon many occasions, intimidate the legislature. The member of parliament who supports every proposal for strengthening this monopoly, is sure to acquire not only the reputation of understanding trade, but great popularity and influence with an order of men whose numbers and wealth render them of great importance. If he opposes them, on the contrary, and still more, if he has authority enough to be able to thwart them, neither the most acknowledged probity, nor the highest rank, nor the greatest public services, can protect him from the most infamous abuse and detraction, from personal insults, nor sometimes from real danger, arising from the insolent outrage of furious and dis-appointed monopolists.’

Just three quarters of a century have past since Adam Smith wrote in this despairing strain, and already events have shown how groundless were his fears. The very interests to which he pointed as opposing, and destined always to oppose, the system which he taught, have become so far enlightened by his writings and by the lessons of experience, that it has been chiefly through the exertions of the manufacturing and trading bodies, that the monopolies, which in his day weighed so heavily, and, to all appearance, so hopelessly, upon the springs of the nation's industry, have for the most part been swept away. It is no less evident that it is to their intelligence that we must now look for maintaining the ground which they have won, and for perfecting the work which yet remains to be accomplished.

It has been at all times a favourite argument with those who seek to impose a duty on imported grain as a protection to British farmers, that such protection is needed as a stimulus to production, and as a security against our land being thrown out of cultivation; the consequence of which would be, that

we should come to be dependent upon foreigners for the most necessary of all articles, and unable at times to keep from starving our constantly and rapidly increasing numbers. But the more reflexion and observation we bestow upon the subject; the more we shall be convinced how utterly baseless is any argument raised upon this foundation. Indeed, our late experience goes to show, that the greatest stimulus to production is given by the low prices which follow upon letting in competition. During the ten years of the present century, —between 1811 and 1820,—the wheat grown on our own soil sufficed for feeding 13,035,639 persons, allowing the yearly consumption of each to be eight bushels. The average price of wheat during those ten years was 88s. 8d. per quarter, and the mean number of the population of Great Britain was 13,494,217. During the next space of ten years, the mean number of mouths having increased to 15,465,474, we fed from our own soil 1,894,843 more than in the previous ten years. Yet what had been the average price for the whole period? It had fallen to 58s. 5d.: or 21s. 7d. per quarter below that, at which it had, in 1815, been declared possible to keep our land in cultivation; and which it was sought to maintain as a minimum, by excluding all foreign imports, when the price should fall below 80s. per quarter. In the following decennium, with prices still further depressed to the average of 56s. 9d., our farmers provided wheat for 1,697,706 of the mouths which in the same period had been added to our numbers, or for 16,628,188 of the 17,535,826 souls then inhabiting Great Britain. We thus see that the stimulus of competition, while it was chiefly confined to competition between our home producers, added to the previous provision food for 27 per cent. more consumers, at the same time that it reduced the average price by fully 29 per cent. It is not possible to apply the same calculation to the ten years through which we have just passed, because of the occurrence of the Irish famine, and of the demolition of the protective system; but we have every reason for believing, that prices having, through the letting in of foreign competition, fallen still lower,—so that the average of our markets is not now beyond one-half the price declared indispensable in 1815,—the stimulus to increased production is at this moment more effective than ever. By means of draining, and the use of very powerful imported manures, the average yield per acre of our fields is greater than at any former period, and is daily being augmented. It is no true or conclusive supposition against the belief here expressed, that our importations of grain having, since the throwing open

of our ports, been upon a scale of unusual magnitude, they must have taken the place of home-grown corn, to the injury of British farmers. This supposition is contradicted by the facts. It should rather be said, that these unaccustomed supplies, added to the greater produce from our own fields, have formed a welcome addition to the food of those among the people who had previously been forced to content themselves, as they best could, with the insufficient amount which fell to their share. These additional supplies afford an undeniable test of the privations suffered in former years.

The increased productiveness of the soil in England, to the effects of which we are now alluding, has of late years mainly resulted from the expenditure of capital in deep draining. In many cases, and more especially where little or nothing had previously been done to the land in the way of improvement, the effect has been to double the quantity of all kinds of produce upon farms; and in other cases, where the land had previously been well managed, from one to two quarters of wheat additional per acre have well repaid the expense of the improvement,—the addition to other products arising from the same cause, being, of course, of equal extent. The drainage already performed must have added immensely to the produce of the land, at the same time that it has more than proportionally diminished the cost of production. In this way the occupying farmer has been enabled to meet the altered state of the markets. Meanwhile the success of the experiment has given an impulse to the outlay of capital in this direction, far greater than at any former period. To what must all this tend, if not to a still greater reduction of prices, which may and will be still compatible with increased profit to the farmer? Of course, on lands where draining is necessary for the full productive powers of the soil, and where, through ignorance, or supineness, or want of means, on the part of landlords, it is not carried out, there will be distress sometimes amounting to ruin among occupying tenants. We must expect to hear their lamentations, and cannot withhold from them our pity; but this, useless as it must be to them, is all that we can be expected to bestow; for it would be the height of cruelty to the rest of the community were we, by any legislative interference, to make society pay for keeping back the improvements, by the neglect of which such partial distress will have been mainly caused. Deeply as the case of these unfortunate individuals is to be commiserated, there is yet nothing in it different from the common lot, which overwhelms with ruin some, while the general mass are benefited through the introduction of improvements. If, through considerations of pity for the sufferers, we

should allow ourselves to throw obstacles in the way of the changes, often painful in many respects, which progress brings along with it, how is the world to advance towards that degree of perfection in any one of the arts of life, by which the increasing well-being of mankind at large is to be secured?

Few persons—none save those who have inquired into the subject—can be at all aware of the amount of misery or of well-being, both physical and moral, which depends on the dearth or cheapness, that is, upon the scarcity or the abundance, of food in a country. These effects are principally felt by those whom, because they are powerless to provide for their own good, by acting on the legislature, we are especially bound to watch over and protect. Even on purely selfish grounds, they demand our especial sympathy and assistance, since, by reason of their want of enlightenment and their numbers, they are exposed to temptation and powerful for mischief in the same proportion. We have already noticed the favourable consequences of low prices to agricultural labourers,—a class which has long occupied the very lowest step on the social ladder in this country. Let us now inquire what these consequences are, as respects the labouring population in towns; and for this purpose we will call Mr. Harris as a witness,—one of the oldest clergymen, both in years and in professional experience, in the east end of London. His parish, where he has been continually occupied for the last thirty years, is one of those outlying parishes on the east side of London, to which many of the poorer class are driven as places of residence, through the absence of equally low priced lodgings in the heart of the town. The following letter from him appeared in ‘The Times’ Newspaper of the 7th of March of the present year. It is so full and convincing in its facts and reasoning, that we cannot do better than give it insertion here. Its testimony is of that eminently practical character which must at once bring conviction to every mind, of the value to many millions of our fellow-subjects of cheapness of food. No one, who has at heart the physical comfort as well as the moral and religious well-being of the poor, we should think, can read it, and any longer withhold his cordial support from a system upon which the temporal, and even the eternal, interests of so many members of society are seen in great measure to depend.

‘I am incumbent of this district—Mile-end New Town—
 ‘which has long claimed an unenviable and unhappy priority
 ‘in destitution and wretchedness amidst the poor districts of
 ‘Spitalfields. Poverty producing no ordinary suffering and
 ‘sorrows, has obtained for us an unavoidable, though most un-

‘desirable notoriety. Such has been Mile-end New Town. Such it has, in a great measure, but by divine blessing, will entirely, I trust, soon cease to be; for the last three years there has been a visible progression here to a healthier and better state of condition among the poor. I no longer find that crushing and hopeless misery in the habitations of the people that for years I was familiarized with; a great improvement both in the social and moral character of the inhabitants is apparent and indubitable. I find, in almost every house, bread to eat, and enough, and with a sufficiency of food, a corresponding change in the dispositions and demeanour of the population. And what, I ask, has effected this alteration? Not increased exertions on the part of the clergyman or his assistants; not more successful issues to our pastoral duties and domiciliary visits; not enlarged liberality on the part of the gentlemen in this vicinage, whose endeavours to ameliorate the condition of their fellow beings need no eulogists. No, sir, by none of this instrumentality has this mighty blessing been achieved, but by what is termed “free trade,” or more simply by the fact, that the people have food brought within their attainment by the repeal of those laws which enhanced all the absolute necessities of life, and thus laid an oppressive and down-beating burden on the poor. The removal of the impost from the food of the poor, I consider the greatest boon that has ever been bestowed on the humbler and destitute ranks of the community. I daily witness among 10,000 of my needy parishioners the blessing which has accompanied it.’

The case of Mile-end New Town cannot be imagined to be a solitary one. The same causes must influence every locality placed under the same circumstances; and it would therefore have greatly surprised us to find, from the inquiries we have been able to carry out in different quarters, that others had not come to the same conclusions as Mr. Harris. Medical men, whose hospital practice has made them acquainted with the habits and constitutions of the working-classes, have remarked, that within the last two years a decided change in them has been observable;—that they are more easily brought within the influence of curative processes, and have a much better chance of recovery from the attacks of disease than at any former time within their experience;—that, to repeat the forcible expression of one of our most popular hospital surgeons, ‘they are more like red-blooded animals.’ It would be unfair to accuse those by whose influence the supply of food was so long limited in this kingdom, of the many evils of which they were unconsciously the cause.

But, with the evidence, by which these evils are now brought home to their mistaken policy, it would no longer be ungenerous to hold them answerable for all the misery which would inevitably follow from the reimposition of shackles upon commerce, — and especially upon commerce in articles of food adapted to the wants of the population at large. Looked at from this point of view, it is nothing less than a sacred moral duty, lying especially at the door of every one who can in any degree influence legislation upon the subject, to prevent the reimposition of restrictions, to which such fatal consequences are attached.

Only one argument can be brought forward by the advocates of Protection, in favour of what is called ‘a moderate fixed duty on corn,’ with any semblance of reason. It is drawn from the still inconsistent state of our tariff, in which are retained import duties upon various articles produced within the kingdom, such as foreign boots and shoes, gloves, embroidery, artificial flowers, and silk manufactures. It is a pity, and more than a pity, — it is an injury, — that these blots are not removed from our list of duties. There is, probably, not one of them which might not be so removed with advantage to the makers and dealers in the same articles at home; while the revenue which they yield ought not to form any obstacle to such removal. One half of the duties previously existing upon silk goods was removed in 1846 without producing the slightest effect to the disadvantage of the English manufacturer, who would be prepared equally to hold his ground if the remaining rates were abolished to-morrow. Linen goods, of almost every description, have now for some years been admitted duty free; and in consequence of the energy imparted to it by competition, the manufacture has since enjoyed a far greater prosperity than it had ever before attained in this country. The only branch of the flax manufacture, which forms an exception to our general progress is the one upon which modified import duties are still retained, viz., cambric handkerchiefs; and in regard to *these*, a principal manufacturer of flax goods has declared, that the only thing wanting to its success, in common with all other fabrics of the same description, is the removal of Protection. During the period of high duties the glove manufacture in England was in so barbarous a state, that no lady was to be seen wearing home-made gloves: the low condition of the trade in extent and profits was a necessary consequence. In 1842 the duty upon foreign gloves was reduced to 3*s.* 6*d.* per dozen pairs. This change produced at first great temporary loss to the manufacturers, many of whom were driven

out of the trade. These, however, were men who would not adopt the requisite improvements, and for every one thus affected many other persons embarked in the manufacture. It soon became greatly extended and much more profitable,—the improvements which were then necessarily adopted, having led in great part to the substitution of English gloves for those of Grenoble and Paris. In short, the spur of competition has produced the result every one might have foreseen. English gloves in general are now undistinguishable from those of foreign make; and we have the testimony of one of our largest manufacturers in favour of the entire removal of all import duty, as no longer giving him any advantage in the home market.

There is not one of the articles upon which duties, having any of the effects of Protection, are still allowed to deform our tariff, that might not be instantly admitted free, without injuring the home producer: nay, without placing our home producers in a safer and better position than they now hold, by causing them to depend for success upon their own exertions, rather than upon the factitious aid of legislation. But, if it were otherwise,—if in the rivalry thus let in upon some few branches of industry, the parties who are engaged in them might be worsted by their foreign competitors,—it must still be better for the general industry of the country that the capital and skill at present engaged in pursuits, which can successfully be prosecuted only through making consumers pay more dearly for their wares than the same could be afforded from abroad, should be transferred to the production of other articles, for which this country is better suited, and which would be exchanged against the cheaper or better productions of foreigners. The Government could not perform a greater service to the cause of Free Trade, nor do more to secure its early and general adoption elsewhere, than by making a clear sweep of these few and inconsiderable duties; which are far more hurtful in their social effects, by leaving an argument in favour of Protection, as founded upon the example of England, than they possibly can be useful in fostering any rickety occupations, or in adding to the public revenue. The following list, taken from the yearly Finance Accounts for 1850, shows the various articles, the duties upon which it is thus, on principle, desirable to repeal; it shows also the revenue derived from them for that year in the United Kingdom.

	£	s.	d
Boots and shoes, and boot fronts - - -	9,110	6	7
China wares - - -	3,427	19	5
Clocks and watches - - -	16,651	18	11
Corks (cut) - - -	5,292	18	2
Embroidery - - -	11,007	3	7
Artificial flowers - - -	15,391	12	4
Leather gloves - - -	43,565	16	3
Manufactures of hair - - -	1,799	19	7
Straw hats - - -	1,283	14	5
Thread and cushion lace - - -	9,621	12	1
Cambrics and handkerchiefs - - -	4,664	11	10
Silk manufactures - - -	218,717	15	0
	<hr/>		
	£340,535	8	2

There is a question relating to our agricultural condition which has often been put without eliciting any answer that will bear examination;—why is it, we cannot grow agricultural products in this country as cheaply as they are grown in the countries whence our foreign supplies are expected chiefly to come? An attempt to answer this question is sometimes made by pointing to our national debt, and to the consequent high rate of taxation to which we are subjected. But if this argument be good for corn, it must be equally good for cotton and hardwares, and for the numerous other goods of British origin which we export, to the value of sixty or seventy millions sterling in the year; and which, of course, we could not so export if we did not produce them cheaper than they are produced in the countries to which they are sent, that is, than every country under the sun. It will not do to say that these exports are made up of articles, the production of which is cheapened through the use of machinery. For, in the first place, we have no monopoly of machinery, and for several years past, the exportation from our shores of every kind of machine has been free; in the next, what is to be said to our exportation of one kind of the raw produce of agriculture? English wool is habitually and largely exported, and no doubt would find its way more largely than it does to foreign lands, if it were not that we are able, in spite of our debt and consequent high taxation, to manufacture it into various fabrics more cheaply than they can be manufactured elsewhere. If taxation has any effect at all upon the cost of production, the effect must be general; and under any circumstances, it could never justify the casting of the burden which it occasions from off one class of producers, upon all other classes, who have already to bear their own share. The farmers of England have, in fact,

many advantages not possessed by those of whose competition they stand most in fear. They have the best market in the world at their own door; and have besides, what is no small advantage in itself, better and cheaper means of transport than are elsewhere to be found, so that the prices of their produce are equalised for their benefit throughout the land. Nowhere in this kingdom do we see, as is the case in several other countries, that a distance of twenty or thirty English miles suffices to create a difference in price of 20 to 30 per cent., on account of the difficulty of conveying bulky produce from one spot to another. To this day it occasionally happens in Spain, that bread is almost at a famine price in some places on the coast, while on the plains in the interior of the kingdom, the wheat is left standing in the fields, not worth the expense of harvesting. We have already noticed the complaint so constantly made of peculiar burdens. The 'farmers' friends' have shown a wise discretion in declining any inquiry into the grievance by Parliamentary Committees,—probably from an impression, that while the burdens they could bring forward might not be found of any serious amount, the peculiar exemptions which they enjoy from burdens that press upon other classes would place the balance of advantages on the side of the agriculturists. If even it should be otherwise, and the farmer has really to bear more than his fair share of taxation,—a thing not very probable considering the composition of the bodies by whom that taxation has hitherto been imposed,—common sense would point to a mode of establishing the balance fairly, instead of transferring the extra load to the remaining classes.

We have heard a good deal at Protectionist meetings concerning the disastrous effects which the repeal of the Corn Laws has had on Ireland; and the returns of agricultural produce collected by direction of Lord Clarendon, and presented to Parliament, are continually referred to, from which it would be made to appear that the breadth of land under wheat cultivation in 1847 was reduced in the following year by 178,125 acres. This reduction, even if correctly stated, would not be at all conclusive as to the question at issue; since it might well happen, that under the system which prescribes a rotation of crops there may in any given year be found more or less of land employed for the production of some particular kind of grain. But the candid gentlemen who declaim on the 'startling' fact thus brought to light by an official document, do not think proper to state, that in the later of the two years *the returns are wholly wanting for the counties of Waterford and Tipperary*. The proper way of looking at this matter is to inquire what number of acres

of land are under cultivation in all its various branches; thus viewed, the argument altogether fails. The total average under crops, as given in the returns, was

in 1847	-	-	-	5,238,575	acres
1848	-	-	-	5,108,062	„
1849	-	-	-	5,543,748	„

Comparing 1847 with 1849, when the returns equally embrace all the counties, there is thus seen to be an increase in 1849, the first year under Free Trade amounting to 305,173 acres. If Waterford and Tipperary are equally excluded from all the years, the quantities will be,

in 1847	-	-	-	4,805,598	acres
1848	-	-	-	5,108,062	„
1849	-	-	-	5,110,771	„

It would not have excited in us the least surprise to find, that under the distressing circumstance of 1847, so fatal to human life, and followed by so unexampled a rate of emigration among the rural population, a greatly diminished cultivation of the soil should have occurred. Accordingly, it is doubly satisfactory to see, that those who remain have thus afforded a strong and practical proof of their disbelief in the Protectionist fears and forebodings of their self-appointed advocates.

One subject, intimately connected with the question of 'protection to agriculture,' and concerning which we used to hear the expression of very serious alarm, appears of late to have been kept pretty much in the background. We allude to the question of rent, a most vital question as affecting the interests of those who have usually been the most clamorous for the imposition of duties upon imported grain. Why is it that the strain of distress has been of late set in a different key, and that the case of the tenant farmers has been so prominently put forward, to excite the pity of the community? Is it that the landowners,—whom the Protectionist agitation mainly, if not wholly, concerns,—are desirous of impressing their tenants with the feeling that, by keeping up the price of corn the burden of rent will be lightened to them to a far greater extent than would take place through any abatement of it which could be reasonably expected from their landlords? This is, perhaps, good policy on the part of the rent receivers, but we cannot compliment the wisdom of those tenants who suffer themselves to fall into the trap. The recovery of Protection must, even to the most sanguine among them, appear extremely doubtful; while it is plainly within the power of any man not bound by the conditions of a lease, to stop short in what is studiously declared to him

to be the road to ruin. He has only to bring his tenancy to a close, unless his landlord will consent to lighten or remove his burden by a readjustment of the bargain between them, and by granting conditions more in agreement with the altered circumstances of the times, as viewed by the advocates of Protection. We are by no means of opinion that, where the landlord has adopted the improvements pointed out by science, and where the land has not been originally too highly rented, any abatement is called for. Where the case is different, and where, as already explained, the operations of a farm must be carried on at a loss, we cannot for a moment admit the justice, or even the common honesty of a landlord, who would hesitate to enter upon such a readjustment. If we should be wrong in our opinion,—if, as prices now rule, and as they are likely to continue while the world's markets for supplies are open to us,—the tenant can no longer pay the same rent as formerly, we say broadly that the landlord must learn to content himself with a lower rate of income. The necessity must then be put up with of returning to the rents, or nearly so, which he drew previous to the war, and before the successive corn-laws which followed had enabled him to occupy, at the general expense, a higher position in society than is the lot of the landowner in other countries, or than was the lot of his own father or grandfather.

There is one casualty to which farming must always be liable, that of ungenial seasons for the ripening or harvesting of crops. If the trade were carried on upon the principles which are found necessary in other branches of business, the farmer would recognise the propriety of providing out of the abundance of one season for the short-comings of another. But it is notorious that no such principle is followed in matters of rural economy; and, since landlords are, in many instances, justly chargeable with lending themselves to this vicious system, by accepting as tenants men not duly qualified by their knowledge or their means for the due performance of what they undertake as tenants, it is only fitting that they should in this case bear a part in the losses and disappointments attendant upon adverse seasons. From the consequences of one such adverse season the farming interest in some of our best managed counties especially is at this time suffering severely. In Cambridgeshire, Lincolnshire, and some other portions of the kingdom, the harvest of 1850 proved greatly inferior in quality, and was by no means abundant in quantity. One of the results of this misfortune is to be seen in the average prices of grain, as advertised in the 'London Gazette.' In the same week of the present year, when

the price of wheat was quoted as being 36s. 9d. per quarter, the finest Essex wheat was sold in Mark Lane at 52s. How exceedingly low, therefore, must have been the prices in some of our markets, to bring down the general average of England and Wales to so reduced a rate. This rate, however, having been quoted as the average, has been held to be the general price of good marketable grain; and has furnished grounds for argument against the admission of foreign produce, upon its being assumed, that it is the foreign produce which has thus brought down the value of our home-grown corn to a price so unsatisfactory to the grower. If the damaged grain of the last harvest could be excluded from the calculation of averages, they would probably be found higher than the rates as advertised, by several shillings per quarter.

The principles which govern trade in farming, should be the same as those which govern every other branch of trade. The profits derived from the employment of capital in the cultivation of land, must be equal to those yielded by other pursuits after replacing the capital employed. If this result be not obtained, it can only be through some mismanagement in the contract between landlords and their tenant farmers;—rent being, in fact, that part of the profit of farming which is realised beyond the ordinary rate of profits on capital engaged in other pursuits. Suppose the rate in the country generally to be equal to 10 per cent., then, in the case of a farm of 300 acres, upon which a capital of 10*l.* per acre is employed, the rate of profit must be equal to 20 per cent., in order to allow the landlord to draw 20s. per acre as his share under the name of rent; and if the profits of the farm should come to be less than 20 per cent., the general rate of profit in the country remaining 10 per cent., the deficiency must in the end be made to fall upon the landowner. In no case can diminished prices when they lower profits,—a result which is far from being general,—press, except temporarily, upon the farmers; a fact which appears to be well known by their landlords, however they may endeavour to conceal it from those whose capitals are engaged in extracting from their lands that amount of profit beyond the ordinary current rate, which enables them to pay rent.

If our country gentlemen were somewhat better informed upon subjects connected with social economy and the distribution of public burdens in other countries, they could never permit themselves to urge, by way of plea for protecting duties, the weight of such burdens upon themselves as compared with the case of landowners in those regions, whence our supplies of foreign corn are chiefly derived.

The following figures are instructive. They set forth the general revenues of some of those countries; they next state the amount of public burden placed in each directly upon the land, and then show them in contrast with the proportion of such burden in this kingdom. If the landowners of England will allow themselves to take into account the wealth and resources of these several countries in comparison with those of their own, they may see reason to console themselves with the conviction that other people are, to say the least, as highly taxed as themselves, while the agricultural body in each is forced to bear a far greater part of the load than falls to their own happier lot.

Countries.		Total Revenue.	Land Tax.	Per-centage of Land Tax.
		£	£	
Austria	- -	14,401,375	4,674,222	32·45
France	- -	54,855,183	10,399,874	18·96
Belgium	- -	4,636,433	734,390	15·84
Holland	- -	5,899,580	830,500	14·07
Bavaria	- -	3,514,980	462,358	13·12
Prussia	- -	13,700,766	1,515,974	11·06
England	- -	57,006,412	1,159,322	2·03

After these remarks, our readers will not be surprised to find it to be our opinion, that as respects the actual cost of tillage and distribution, the English farmer does bring his produce to market as cheaply as his competitor in other countries; and,—if there be great distress among a portion of the class, as is unfortunately but too true,—that such distress is far from being general, and is attributable to causes for which the adoption of Free-trade principles is in no wise accountable.

We have already alluded to farms where nothing has been done for their improvement, and where the occupiers being brought into competition with others for whom improvements have been provided, are comparatively unable to meet the reduction of price. The remedy for this state of things is clearly not within the province of legislation, which cannot justly be called on to equalise the profits between those who farm well and those who farm ill, nor between the occupiers of good land and of bad, nor to bring up the profits of the bad farmer of an ungrateful soil to a scale which would be considered by him as constituting a satisfactory level. May we venture to suggest that there are other causes at work, and which in a greater or less degree have always been at work, sufficient to keep many of our farmers in a condition of comparative poverty? or, at any rate, to have prevented those additions to their capital which

every man in business should seek to realise as the fair return for his talent and industry?

It is the general rule among our farmers, to look at the average prices of grain as the sole evidence of prosperity, or the reverse. Meanwhile, they neglect the causes by which markets are influenced, and seldom consider that, while a high price may be a pretty sure indication that the farmer has but little for sale, a low price may result from more than usual abundance; and that this latter state of things is indeed always accompanied by circumstances which render such low prices more remunerative. A large portion of every crop is consumed upon the farm; and other agricultural produce, besides what is raised by them, is always more or less required by the farmers for their own use. For the first of these quantities it cannot matter what prices are obtainable; while, as regards what is bought, the general cheapness of farm produce must be an advantage. It is besides to be remarked, that, as respects one important branch of farming—the dairy—no change of prices has followed the abandonment of Protection; and in this case the cost of what they buy being lessened, while the returns for what they sell are sustained, the condition of the dairy farmer must be one of comparative prosperity. Let it be granted, however, for argument's sake, that the condition of our farmers has been injured by taking from them Protection, there then arises another question; viz., have they availed themselves of all the means which are open to them for averting the evil? Have they turned their attention to the production of such crops not previously raised, as promise to be remunerative? A highly intelligent tenant farmer has certified on his own experience, that by devoting one tenth of his farm yearly to the growth of flax, the profit has been found to repay all the expenses of its cultivation, and to provide a fund sufficient to pay the rent of the whole farm; while a judicious use of the seed and refuse of the flax crop has enabled him to carry on the general operations of his farm upon more favourable terms than, without such cultivation, would have been possible. There are, besides, many small articles of farm produce habitually imported, for raising which there does not appear to be any peculiar facility in other countries, and which might therefore be advantageously produced at home. It may seem trifling to speak of eggs; but the illustration is only the more striking; and, — if we consider that every year we import from neighbouring countries, in the face of a duty which yields a revenue of nearly 40,000*l.*, much more than 100,000,000 of these articles of daily consumption, — it must appear strange that persons, who are suffering distress from interference with their usual course of

production, should not have turned their attention to a resource which others with no superior means find it worth their while to attend to. Then the condition of comparative ease, in which the working population are now happily placed through the cheapness of bread, enables them to consume a much larger quantity of meat than was within their reach in former times; and, although considerable capital may be required to keep and fatten any large number of horned beasts, it is not so in the case of pigs, and there is no kind of food more to the taste of labourers and their families than bacon. Pigs may be fed and fattened upon root crops at a moderate outlay; and while they are highly profitable in themselves, the animals furnish a quantity of manure of the most useful description, greatly facilitating and cheapening the general operations of the farm.

It is a very common remark, and we believe not more common than true, that there is a disposition, on the part of many who follow the trade of farming, to undertake more than they have the means to accomplish profitably. The man whose capital is equal to stock and manage 300 acres, will too often be found in the occupation of 400 or 500 acres; and when, at the end of the year, he finds his capital has not increased, but is possibly slipping away, he never thinks of casting the blame upon his own miscalculation. The want of legislative protection, he complains, has prevented him from getting for his produce prices which might have shielded him from the consequences of his own imprudence. It is still more generally the case—and this even with men whose capital is sufficient for what they undertake—to expect that they are to live in a greater degree of comfort and indulgence than falls to the share of tradesmen with equal capital in other branches of business. The man, for instance, who takes a farm of 300 acres, and who stocks and works it adequately with a capital of 3,000*l.*, often lives in a style to which a man of 5,000*l.* capital, or more, employed in a retail trade, would never think of aspiring. He commonly dwells in a very comfortable house, and spreads his table without stint or carefulness; he is glad to see his friends around his board, which, as it is in great part furnished without any money payment, but from the farm-yard, seems to be scarcely counted by him among his expenses: he keeps his saddle-horse for pleasure,—very possibly, too, a hunter, and never misses attending the town on market days, whether his business calls him there or not. The difference between the cost of his dinner, together with what follows it at the market ordinary in the cause of good fellowship, and the cost of the meal at home, is set down—if, indeed, any heed is taken of

it—to the account of business expenditure. It is, besides, remarked by observant by-standers that, although farming be not without its anxieties, arising from the vicissitudes of seasons, it is without many other and greater anxieties, inseparable from other callings; and that it is seldom pursued with the same assiduity and incessant attention which are indispensable to success in ordinary employments,—in other words, it partakes more of the nature of pastime than of business, and for that reason does not justify the demand for an equally high remuneration in the shape of profits. In corroboration of this opinion, we may mention that, conversing lately with an intelligent gentleman of ample means, who farms more than 4,000 acres, he stated it as the result of his own experience, that any man acquainted with the subject, who should at the present time, and with the prospect of existing prices, follow farming as a serious matter of business, would find that ‘there is not a better business going.’

We are not aware of having left unnoticed and unanswered any serious Protectionist argument in favour of a recurrence to the system of Corn-laws, from which the country has so lately, and after so severe a social struggle, been relieved. As friends of peace and order, we must, however, venture to point out to our opponents the danger which would be incurred,—if their effort to restore a duty on the importation of food should be temporarily successful, and if it should be followed, as of course they would desire it to be followed, by any serious enhancement of prices. Does the suspicion never cross their minds that, in such a state of things, the millions, who compose the working classes in Great Britain, having experienced for a season the blessings which flow from cheap living, would not fail to question the right of any class to put its class-interests into direct antagonism with theirs, and to plunge them again into want and wretchedness? The careful observer may even now detect symptoms of these feelings, when, in populous places, the choice of a majority of the electors may have fallen upon some one suspected of a desire to favour the Protective System. We are not among the number of the friends of Free Trade, who are supposed to look with apprehension to a general election. We will not, until we see it, believe in the return of a majority to the House of Commons who shall hold the principles of Protection, and be prepared to act upon them; but suppose a Protectionist majority once more to have got possession of the House of Commons, and to venture upon this wild experiment, can it be conceived that organised bodies would not assemble again in thousands through the length and breadth of the land,

in opposition to a course of legislation so generally felt to be unjust, and again compel their adversaries to retrace their steps? and is it not too probable that they would then insist upon taking full securities against the possibility of having to enter upon a similar contest in future with the proprietors of the soil? This is a consideration upon which we are most unwilling to enlarge; and, in the hope that landed proprietors will not overlook it, we proceed to offer a few remarks on some other branches of the Free-trade question, respecting which much misrepresentation is put forward by its opponents.

It is a favourite theory with those who are adverse to a reduction of duties upon articles of foreign produce, that such duties are paid by the producers, and thus come in aid of the taxation of this country,—a theory upon the exposure of which we do not think it necessary to waste another word. Taking it for certain that every penny of tax upon articles consumed within the kingdom, is paid by the individual consumers, let us inquire what has been the effect on the public revenue, and on the comforts of the people of this United Kingdom, of the progressive reductions which have been made during the past twenty years in our customs and excise duties.

There was collected of these duties, in 1821, the sum of 38,765,814*l.* Between that year and 1849, various duties were repealed and reduced, amounting to 27,801,667*l.*; so that the sum remaining to be collected under these two heads of revenue was reduced by computation to 10,964,147*l.* So great, however, has been the additional power of consuming imparted to the people by the cheapening of articles of general use, that the revenue collected in 1849 from the unrepealed duties amounted to 34,622,284*l.*, being 23,658,137*l.* beyond the computed amount, and considerably more than three times as great as, without such cheapening, we should have received.

The effect of this state of things upon the comforts of the people may be best illustrated by taking a single article of general use, and showing the addition made to the quantity consumed by reason of the relaxation of the Protective System. In 1821, the customs' duty payable on each hundred weight of sugar, the production of British possessions, was 27*s.*, and the quantity consumed within the kingdom was 3,056,882 cwts.,—being equal to an average consumption of 16 lbs. 2 oz. per head. At that time all foreign sugar was completely excluded, by means of a rate of duty greater than the value of the sugar after the duty should have been paid; and thus a most complete monopoly of the home market was given to our sugar-producing colonies. In 1849, when there still remained a protecting duty

to some extent, but not enough to exclude from use the produce of foreign lands, the rate of duty upon British-grown sugar was lowered to eleven shillings per cwt.: upon which, the quantity used within the kingdom, including that of foreign origin, rose to 6,287,217 cwts. This was equal to an average consumption, by the increased population, of 24 lbs. 1 oz.,—being 50 per cent. greater than the average consumption of 1821; while the loss to the revenue between the two periods was but little more than 4 per cent.,—the rate of duty having been lessened by more than 59 per cent. The value to the people of this approach to the principle of Free Trade, is not confined to the additional command which it has given them over the use of an increased quantity of an article of general desire; but is also to be sought in the additional amount of industry which it has called into action, that so we may provide the means for making returns to the various countries from which this increased quantity has been drawn.

It cannot be necessary to multiply the instances in which the carrying out of Free-trade principles into practical operation has been found to conduce to the comfort and prosperity of the people; and we shall draw our observations to a close by briefly examining the result, so far as can yet be ascertained, of the approximation towards freedom of commerce lately made in our laws relating to Navigation.

It having been shown, by returns presented to Parliament, that the tonnage of British vessels entering the ports of the United Kingdom in 1850, was somewhat less than it was in 1849, occasion was taken to sound the alarm, as though our whole shipping interest was doomed to destruction. The vessels which arrived in our ports during the two years under the British flag, were

	<i>Ships.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>
1849	23,646	4,884,210
1850	22,709	4,700,199
Less in 1850	937	184,011

In addition to this—to them alarming fact—it is seen that a very large increase has been experienced in the number and tonnage of foreign shipping, which entered our ports in 1850, beyond those of the preceding year, viz.:—

	<i>Ships.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>
1850	15,145	2,400,277
1849	13,426	2,035,690
More in 1850	1,719	364,587

Whatever may be said concerning the decline of British shipping, as revealed by these figures, it is clear that they indicate no decline of British commerce, since it has required 180,000 tons more to convey to us the merchandise which we have imported. But let us inquire how far the figures which we have given above are to be taken as evidence of any real falling off in the employment of British shipping. In the first place, we must remark, that it would have been very surprising, after all that was so industriously circulated,—as it were inviting foreigners to engage in a trade newly opened to them, and in which it was so confidently affirmed they would compete with great advantage to themselves,—if, they had not been tempted in greater numbers than formerly to our shores. Instead of lamenting that we have been visited by 360,000 tons additional of ships under foreign flags, we may rather feel surprise that a still larger number has not been attracted by the golden harvest which was promised them. The real questions at issue, however, are,—has any proportion of our own shipping been deprived of employment in consequence? and has any check been put to the building of additional vessels for the carriage of our constantly increasing trade? It does not appear to have occurred to those who have seized on the fact of a lessened British tonnage having entered our ports, that possibly the prevalence of a contrary wind at the close of the year might have interfered with the arrivals;—in effect those arrivals in the first three months of the present year have exceeded those of the corresponding period of 1850 by 134,000 tons: Neither do they take any account of the comparative tonnage which left our shores *with cargoes*, and which, as not being equally exposed to the uncertainties of weather, might fairly be thought to afford more correct materials for comparison. Now it happens, that the tonnage of national vessels so employed in 1850, exceeded that of 1849 by 198,582 tons; while the excess in the first three months of 1851, over the tonnage in the same three months of 1850, has been 70,000 tons. In making this comparison we have purposely excluded all ships which cleared *in ballast*, in order to steer clear of the objection, that in despair of obtaining employment at home, our vessels have sailed away empty in search of it elsewhere. There is, however, another answer to the assertion of our inability to compete with foreign shipping: and the answer may be received with all confidence by the most sceptical unbeliever in the competing powers of our ship-owners; since it is drawn from the official records of another government, which cannot be suspected of any desire to falsify the facts. It is well known that, by way of retaliation against the

navigation system of England, the United States of America long since adopted a law which excluded from their ports all English ships with cargoes brought from third countries,—the law, in other particulars also, being copied from the trading regulations of this country. This American law was simply retaliatory; so that, as a matter of course,—when we no longer excluded from our ports the shipping of America, upon its arriving from any third country,—their ports were, in like manner, thrown more widely open to our mercantile marine. We have now before us the returns relating to American trade and navigation during the year ending 30th June, 1850, and therefore embracing only six months during which the more liberal system had been in force. The returns in question show, that in those six months there entered the harbours of the United States, with cargoes from foreign ports, in cases where all such trading had been before prohibited, British shipping to the amount of 68,004 tons. Can there be stronger proof that we are able to compete in their own ports, and under circumstances where we cannot possibly possess any advantage over them, with our much dreaded rivals? It is reasonable to believe, that this competition has been continued, on at least an equal scale, during the second half of the year. Thus, in one single direction, our ships have found a new trade for which, through the operation of the law which was predicted to be their ruin, they have been led by the encouragement of greater profits to abandon for a time the trades to which they had previously been restricted; and this has taken place to an extent sufficient to account for three-fourths of the presumed deficiency, which it has been attempted to convert into a cause of lamentation and despair. A further source of satisfaction may be found in these American returns from the fact, that a still larger amount of British tonnage than that which arrived in the United States from previously forbidden ports, obtained employment in direct competition with American vessels for the conveyance of cargoes from their own ports to foreign countries. This double carrying trade has been prosecuted with almost every part of the world, including the various countries of Northern and Southern Europe, the Foreign West Indies, Mexico, Brazil, and other South American States, China, and the Indian Archipelago. It needs not to be remarked that our shipping thus employed must have been at least delayed for several months on their return home, and could not possibly, therefore, have figured in the list of our arrivals in 1850.

The enterprise of our merchants, now left to their unprotected energies, is daily exploring fresh channels for the employ-

ment of their capitals. Among these new employments a trade which promises some extension has sprung up between Hong Kong and the west coast of North and South America, to which many of the products of China are now conveyed. During the first half of 1850, thirty ships, measuring 10,776 tons, left Hong Kong with cargoes of those products, consisting of silks, lacquered wares, tea, sugar, and numerous other articles, together with considerable quantities of building materials fashioned by the industry of our own subjects on that island,—such as wrought granite, wooden frame houses, and planed lumber. The proportion of English shipping so employed was 18 ships of 6,842 tons burden, while the Americans furnished only 5 ships of 1,156 tons burden.

But, what is the direct experience furnished by our own ports? We should now look there in vain for those evidences of distress on the part of shipowners which, at different times, while protection to the national trader was the order of the day, were wont to salute our eyes in the form of the broom at the mast-head of scores of stately vessels. In one of those documents, from which the best commercial knowledge may frequently be derived—a broker's printed circular, compiled a very few months ago at Liverpool,—we find it stated; that, 'The continued scarcity of British shipping in the port obliges many foreign vessels to be taken for the Brazils and other parts which would not otherwise be the case; whilst so actively employed elsewhere are our best A 1. ships that great difficulty is found in procuring vessels for which a tonnage of 300 to 400 tons is only admissible.' Nor is it in our own ports only, that the want of British shipping is experienced. In a letter which we have seen, dated from Galatz in September last, it is mentioned, that, 'The grain trade is likely to suffer very much from want of shipping, and extravagant freights may rule. At least 200 vessels are wanted for England, perhaps 300 may be wanted, and it does not appear that 100 are on their way to the Danube.'

Among the alarmists, whose fears were the most loudly expressed when our restrictive system of Navigation Laws was changed, were to be found our shipbuilders. They declared their total inability to meet the competition of the north of Europe and of the United States of America; and statements were brought by them before the Committees of both Houses of Parliament, showing the greater cost of British-built ships in comparison with those dreaded rivals. These fears have proved to be altogether groundless. In the whole of 1850 the foreign-built vessels registered in the various ports of this kingdom

and its foreign possessions were in number only 57, of 10,499 tons burden; a truly insignificant amount when it is considered that in that year our market was first opened to the foreigner, and that the outcry raised concerning the greater cost of our ships would naturally induce foreigners to send here for sale such vessels as they might desire to part with, and which they might expect to replace on cheaper terms through their own shipwrights.

In the meantime, an important result has followed from the repeal of our Navigation Law—the cheapening of the cost of ship-building in this country. The method of classing ships according to the materials employed in their construction, supplies an unerring test of comparative value. A ship classed as A 1. for twelve years, or for ten years, may be reckoned equal in value to any other ships so classed for the same number of years; in calculating the cost of vessels it is therefore proper to compare those of equal standing. Judged in this way, it may now be confidently affirmed, that English-built ships are at least as cheap as those built in any other country whatever. It was given in evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons on the Navigation Laws, by an experienced ship-builder, that the cost of building and fitting for sea a twelve years ship was, in 1847, 22*l.* 10*s.* per ton in the river Thames, at Liverpool, or in Glasgow, and 18*l.* at Sunderland; and ‘that for every year of diminished period for which a ship may be adapted to stand on the first letter in Lloyd’s register, about 1*l.* per ton may be deducted from the cost.’ We have before us a list of prices at which ships may now be built at Sunderland and fitted for sea in the West India trade. The following figures show the reduction from the prices of 1847, since the change in our system, by letting in foreign competition, has set our shipbuilders upon economising and on adopting such improvements as may enable them to set competitors at defiance:—

Class of Ship.	Cost at Sunderland in 1847.	Cost at Sunderland in 1851.
A. 1. 12 years	£18	£14 10 <i>s.</i>
11 ”	17	13 10
10 ”	16	13 0
9 ”	15	12 10
8 ”	14	11 10

A ship classed A 1. for thirteen years, which it was said in 1847 would cost, coppered and fitted for sea, 24*l.* per ton, has this year been built and completed, under the most careful inspection, for 15*l.* 10*s.* per ton. The tonnage built and regis-

tered in the several ports of the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands during the last three years, was:—

1848	-	-	-	125,940 tons.
1849	-	-	-	121,266 „
1850	-	-	-	137,530 „

At no period in the commercial history of this country was there more activity than is now shown in our ship-building ports; and it has been remarked, that at no time has the class of ships built been of so high a character as at present: a certain proof that our merchants generally are far from sharing in the fears which were expressed when the question of the Navigation Laws was under discussion. On this point surely Lord Stanley may feel at ease.

In whatever direction we inquire into the results of the Free-trade System, so far as it has hitherto been carried into effect in England, we find the same increased activity, with equal success. Protectionists may strive to get up alarms and endeavour to convince the world, against our senses and the nature of things, that our increased imports and exports, and the augmented burden of the ships on our registers, are proofs of advancing ruin; but their efforts must make less and less impression, as the public become from day to day better acquainted with the subject. Our merchants will laugh to scorn all such absurdities; and while they can refer to their ledgers for records of increased transactions and augmented profits, will be but little likely to join in again putting those shackles upon commerce, under the restraint of which they feel that their action would be crippled and their progress impeded.

Even the criminal returns of the kingdom have been pressed into the service of the Protectionists. By showing that there have been more frequent commitments for serious crimes since the adoption of the Free-trade policy, it has been sought to connect an increase of crime with the cheapening of the means of living by honest labour; — a connexion which could only be imagined by persons predetermined to set at defiance the first principles of common sense. But let us see how the fact really stands. It is stated that the number of commitments has advanced from 47,668 in 1846 to 74,162 in 1849; a truly appalling increase, if unaccompanied and uncorrected by explanation. But these numbers include the commitments in Ireland, which, from causes notorious to all the world, rose during that interval from 18,492 to 41,982. The unreasonableness of including in any such comparison the criminal statistics of Ireland, — considering the distress, through want of food, which has prevailed there, more or less, during the years in question, —

and the especial extravagance of attributing the increase to causes which have tended to lessen that distress, must be evident to every one. We will conclude what we have to say on this point, by a tabular comparison of the real amount of criminality in England and Wales alone during each of the five years from 1846 to 1850:—

Years.	Committed.	Convicted.	Executed.	Sentenced to	
				Death.	Transportation.
1846.	25,107	18,144	6	56	2805
1847	28,833	21,542	8	51	2806
1848	30,349	22,900	12	60	3251
1849	27,816	21,001	15	66	2844
1850	26,813	20,537	6	49	2578

These figures prove that criminality in England and Wales tested by the returns, was really less in 1850 than in any one of the years brought forward. The actual number, both of committals and convictions, was, indeed, greater in 1850 than in 1846; but taking into the account the increase of the population, it was virtually smaller; while the actual number itself is lower than in any one of the three years following 1846. Compared by the test of punishments awarded, which affords the only rational means for judging of the intensity of crime, the last year of the series presents a more consolatory view of this particular objection; since the number sentenced to death and transportation, which include all crimes of a serious character, appear to have been very considerably less in 1850 than in any other of the five years.

We have thus succeeded, we think, in showing that in whatever direction the condition of our population is examined with reference to the effect of Free-trade measures, there is found a great and manifest improvement, with the sole exception of some part of the tenant-farmers,—that their exceptional distress is fairly attributable to the false position in which they have been placed through the unjust legislation of former years,—and that their relief must now be expected principally from their own energy and judgment in a more skilful application of the resources of science to the work before them.

- ART. VII. — 1. *The Roman Wall: a Historical, Topographical, and Descriptive Account of the Barrier of the Lower Isthmus, extending from the Tyne to the Solway, deduced from numerous personal Surveys.* By the Rev. JOHN COLLINGWOOD BRUCE, M. A. 8vo. 1851.
2. *The Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver, and Lynne, in Kent.* By CHARLES ROACH SMITH, F. S. A. 4to. 1850.
3. *Illustrations of the Remains of Roman Art in Cirencester, the Site of Ancient Corinium.* By Professor BUCKMAN, F. L. S., F. G. S., &c., and C. H. NEWMARCH, Esq. 8vo. and 4to. 1850.
4. *Description of a Roman Building and other Remains lately discovered at Caerleon.* By JOHN EDWARD LEE. 8vo. 1850.

A FEW months ago we were walking with a reverend and respected friend over one of the fields in his parish, when our attention was fixed on some fragments of Roman tiles scattered over the ground. A labourer came up at this moment, a man well known to our friend, who suggested to him that he might find something curious in digging in this vicinity. ‘Aye, aye,’ replied the labourer, ‘we often turn up queer old-fashioned things; t’other day Jack West and I were trenching in the next field, and turned up an old pickle-jar; it was all whole and sound; we thought it was a money-pot, but deuce a bit was there any thing in it but a few burnt bones. I had a mind to bring it you, but Jack West kicked it to pieces.’ On our expressing a wish to see all that remained of the unfortunate ‘pickle-jar,’ he brought us the fragments, which proved to be those of an elegantly formed Roman sepulchral urn — a trace of the footsteps of the conquerors and rulers of the ancient world. We could not repress an exclamation of regret at the vandalism of Jack West; upon which our rustic informant observed, ‘La, sir! Jack is such an ignorant fellow! I asked him not to break it, but he would do it — there’s no bounds to his ignorance!’

Such is the story, not only of the destruction of a large portion of the materials which might have thrown light on the history of a period at present most obscure, but also of the sort of false interest in such articles spread among the ignorant peasantry by injudicious collectors, which has only excited a cupidity scarcely less destructive than ignorance itself. The ignorance displayed by Jack West was no doubt boundless, but the self-imagined superior knowledge of his companion was not a

bit more conservative; nor can it be expected that he will ever be made to value the 'pickle-jar,' except with a view to its expected contents. Six or seven centuries ago our island was covered with monuments of the Roman occupation—monuments which would have told a history which is now lost; whole cities were then standing, walls, and houses, and public buildings, whose ruins had been left by the hostility of barbarian invaders, and spared long afterwards even by time itself. They might have been spared to tell their story for centuries more, but for the wanton destruction of a later age, when no antiquarian societies as yet existed for their protection. Horsley says, in his '*Britannia Romana*,' (1732,) that, 'according to Dr. Stukeley, a good part of the wall at Verulam was standing three years ago; but, as he rode through the old city, he saw them carrying off hundreds of loads of Roman bricks to mend 'the highway.' It would hardly be believed, were we not well certified of the fact, that within the last few weeks the act of Vandalism complained of by Stukeley, has been repeated, and that another portion of the walls of Verulamium has been wantonly demolished! What is still worse,—within the memory of man, some of our peasantry have been found ignorant and superstitious enough to break sculptures for fear they might be instruments of witchcraft, and to erase inscriptions lest they should be noxious charms. While, however, the hand of man has been occupied in obliterating the memorials of the past, the hand of time, contrary in this instance to its usual practice, has protected an important portion of them by burying them in earth, the accumulation of centuries; and it is under the surface of the ground that we have now to look for the only records which will ever throw further light on the condition of this country during the first six centuries of the Christian era.

Some of the principal cities raised by the Romans in this country are lying, at the present time, concealed under the soil. It happened in many cases that a monastery or a castle was founded, in the middle ages, near the ruins of a Roman town, expressly because the latter furnished a ready supply of materials for the builders. Not that in the end it made any substantial difference. For, where there was no castle or abbey, these materials served for less dignified purposes. Along the line of the Roman Wall in the north, there is hardly a house, or barn, or even garden wall, the stones of which have not been squared by the hands of Roman masons. Thus were the walls of houses and public edifices gradually broken down: but this process in general did not take place until a period when the earth had already accumulated to a considerable elevation above the Roman

level; and the mediæval builders seem to have been satisfied with breaking down the walls to the surface of the ground as it then existed. According to the chronicles of the abbey of St. Alban's, the monks of that house dug to the foundations of the buildings of Verulamium in search of building materials; but this was certainly a rare case, and even there recent excavations seem to show that the statement of the chronicles was at least exaggerated. In many cases, as at Silchester (*Calleva*) in Hampshire, Kenchester (*Magna*) in Herefordshire, and perhaps Ribchester (*Coccium*) in Lancashire, the floors and lower parts of the buildings of some of the most important Roman cities in the island lie at no great depth under ground, undisturbed since they were first ruined by their barbarian conquerors. In many other cases, in which the site is still occupied by an inhabited town, where earth accumulates more quickly, the old level has been seldom reached by the foundations and cellars of the houses of a later period; and the Roman remains are only accidentally brought to light on modern excavators sinking deeper than usual. This is the case in London itself. In such a place as Silchester, it would naturally require a considerable expenditure of time and money to uncover the whole area, but by so doing we should no doubt obtain a very exact knowledge of the character and appearance of a Roman city in England, — a sort of Provincial Pompeii, — how its houses and streets were distributed, what were their extent, and how they were inhabited. We should find a multitude of articles of various descriptions, — some of them perhaps remarkable as works of art, but all such as would throw light upon the condition and domestic manners of the inhabitants. And, what is still more important, we might probably find inscriptions which would tell us new facts relating to their history. The solitary urn is in itself of little interest, except so far as it shows that the spot in which it was found has been more or less permanently occupied by the people to whom it formerly belonged. It is by collecting and collating that we gradually arrive at more significant results, in relation first to individual localities, and then, by a more general comparison of these, to the history of the country at large.

Within a few years, much has been done in this way in producing materials for a new and more satisfactory history of the Romans in Britain. The first steps towards this great object must necessarily be taken by local inquirers, and we here feel the advantage of encouraging the formation of local museums and local societies. By collecting and preserving antiquities in the district to which they relate, we give them an interest which

they would not possess elsewhere; and mere catalogues of local collections of this kind would be of great value to those whose studies enable them by such means to clear up the portions of the history of the country to which they refer. But when we are so fortunate as to meet with gentlemen on the spot who possess both opportunity and inclination to investigate local antiquities of this description, as well as the talents and knowledge requisite to lay the results of their investigations effectively before the public, the interest is increased tenfold: And it is one of the satisfactory results of the antiquarian agitation of late years that many such local investigators have been brought into existence, and that their number is multiplying daily.

We have a substantial proof of this in the four books now lying before us, and we certainly know of no instance in which any one year, or even, we may venture to say, any ten years, have produced an equal number of similar publications distinguished by so much sterling merit. Mr. Collingwood Bruce is a clergyman of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, an active member of the Newcastle Antiquarian Society, who has spent several years in investigating the gigantic remains of the Wall of Hadrian, the most famous boundary of Roman Britain to the north. About two years ago a party of Newcastle antiquaries, under the guidance of Mr. Bruce, made a pilgrimage along the whole line of the Wall, from Bowness on the west (*Tunnocelum*) to its other extremity at the now celebrated locality of Wallsend (*Segedunum*). Their tour, obtaining publicity through the newspapers, called general attention to this remarkable monument of Roman power and enterprise; and Mr. Bruce has ably illustrated it in the book of which the title heads the present article. Mr. Lee is a gentleman of Caerleon, in Monmouthshire, a small town occupying a part of the site of the *Isca Silurum* of the Romans, once a city of great importance. In 1845 he published a quarto volume of 'Discoveries of Roman Antiquities found at Caerleon,' a very interesting book in consequence of its site, especially for the inscriptions. To this his 'Description of a Roman Building and other Remains lately discovered at Caerleon,' forms a supplement, and it is published solely for the benefit of the museum which owes its existence to Mr. Lee's zeal and liberality. Professor Buckman, in conjunction with Mr. Newmarch, another gentleman of Cirencester, has devoted what leisure he could spare from professional occupations to examining into its antiquities. It is the site of *Corinium*, one of the richest and most fashionable of the Roman inland towns; and their volume, as becomes the former glories of *Corintum*, is certainly the handsomest of them all. In honour of many of the subjects described, and especially

the tessellated pavements, it is properly entitled 'Remains of 'Roman Art;' and it is eminently valuable for the chemical investigation of the Roman materials. Of Mr. Roach Smith we need only say that he has been for some time generally known as the soundest scholar of the day in the Roman antiquities of Britain, and that his character is well sustained by his recent inquiry into the 'Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver, and Lynne.' If we add to the works already enumerated, Wellbeloved's 'Eburacum' (on the Roman antiquities of York), and the 'Caledonia Romana' of the late Robert Stuart, of Edinburgh*, we shall have a series of volumes on the Roman antiquities of particular sites in this country, all (except Wellbeloved's 'Eburacum') published within some half-dozen years, far superior to any thing of the same kind that England had produced before, and equal to the best works of the continental archæologists. Nor ought we to omit the mention of a still more recent publication†, 'The Archæology and Prehistoric Annals of 'Scotland,' by Daniel Wilson, Hon. Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland; although the Roman period occupies only a comparatively small portion of the whole. Mr. Wilson has undertaken a very large and elaborate classification of the earlier antiquities of Scotland. It is a very instructive and interesting, as well as very handsome book: and, out of a wide range, all of which is well deserving the attention of the antiquary, he has devoted one chapter to the traces which the Roman invasion left behind it. These are more numerous than we should have expected, and are sufficient to show that the conquerors, in spite of their precarious tenure, had time to plant between the Walls some portion of their civilisation and their love of the arts.

It is not, however, in towns and cities alone that the Romans left marks of their footsteps. We can hardly find a spot of ground in England, hill or valley, field or wood, even what is now solitary and uncultivated heaths, but we tread upon sites where Roman hands have been busy. In investigating these numerous traces of antiquity, and placing our investigations together, we become aware that Britain under the Romans was a country abounding not only in flourishing

* Since the above was written, a new edition of Stuart's 'Caledonia Romana' has been announced: it is to be published, we understand, for the benefit of his widow, and will contain additions of his own as well as those of the editor.

† Edin. 1851. (Part iii. chap. 2., The Roman Invasion, pp. 363—407.)

cities and towns, but in country villas and houses, many of them magnificent in appearance and extent, traversed in every direction by excellent roads, its rivers crossed by strong and handsome bridges, forming a communication between districts, some of which were remarkable for their manufactures, while others were covered with well-cultivated farms, from which large supplies of corn were sent annually to Gaul, and even, it is said, to Italy. We do not share Camden's faith in Romano-British vineyards. But the great civiliser, agriculture, must have made immense progress by the time the Britain of Boadicea had become, through its *annona* or corn tribute, an exporting country, and Julian could be sending 800 ships backwards and forwards in one year for British grain. Roman capitalists, indeed, seem soon to have speculated on the capabilities of the island as a field for profitable investment. For among the minor causes of Boadicea's insurrection is mentioned the sudden violence with which Seneca had called in a loan he had forced upon the chiefs against their will. Roman usury appears afterwards to have fattened on the prosperity of the settlers. In the fourth century, a brother of Ausonius the poet is said to have amassed an immense fortune by lending out money at interest in Britain. Facts of this kind bespeak great national progress. But among the *Excerpta de Britannia ex Scriptoribus Græcis atque Latinis*, in Mr. Petrie's 'Monumenta Historica Britannica,' they are scarcely visible; and when we look to written history for an explanation of the remains which are constantly reappearing from underground, it is but little that written history has to say. Poussin's *mot* at Rome, on gathering a handful of earth,—*Questa é Roma antica*,—applies to other places besides Rome, and with a still stronger meaning.

The Romans made their first attempt on Britain A.C. 55, under Julius Cæsar; and finally abandoned their conquest A.D. 436, during the reign of Valentinian. Their connexion with the country, therefore, lasted five hundred years. The space was long enough for a distinct and permanent impression. But in the minds of most people the whole of it is confounded with the darkness which preceded and the desolation which followed it. The space begins with a blank of a hundred years (*longa oblitio*). Tacitus treats Cæsar, who left behind him neither garrison nor settlement, as little more than the discoverer of the island. Claudius (*auctor operis*), A. D. 43, set about reducing it in earnest: yet neither he nor Nero appear to have seriously advanced beyond the Humber. The reigns of Vespasian and Domitian were distinguished, by the eight years' successes of Agricola, beginning A. D. 78. But the distant

island formed so small a speck in the Roman Empire,—not much more than New Zealand in our own,—that we should probably have known little of Agricola or his conquests but for the good fortune, which gave him Tacitus for a son-in-law. It is plain, however, in the general (says Horsley), ‘that the Roman power was at its greatest height in Britain when Agricola resigned; and that under the two following reigns of Nerva and Trajan, this island was almost wholly neglected’ (*perdomita Britannia et statim amissa*). As the remoter parts of Cornwall, Wales, and Scotland are supposed to be the only places where the Roman armies had not at that time penetrated, their power might perhaps be never spread over a greater geographical breadth of country; but surely it must have been striking deeper root from year to year, and strengthening gradually in all those interests which characterise its provincial sway. The interval of forty years between the landing of Aulus Plautius and the campaigns of Agricola, is far too short a period for the *porticus et balnea et conviviorum elegantia* attributed by Tacitus to the Romanised Britons, to be much more than a sarcasm on the servile affectation of the barbarians; especially when we compare it with Xiphiline’s picture of the life of the non-Romanised Britons, as Severus found them a hundred years later,—in tents, naked, and with women in common. Hadrian succeeded in A.D. 117, and was saluted by his poet Florus,—‘*Ego nolo Cæsar esse, Ambulare per Brittannos, Scythicas pati pruinas*,’—as a natural combination. His reign follows on a total blank of more than thirty years, unenlightened by a single inscription,—the first of a series of successive gaps, stretching in all upwards of two hundred years, and making a formidable chasm out of the five hundred that the connexion lasted.

Horsley claims, for the first or historical book of his ‘*Britannia Romana*,’ the credit of its being the first history we have of Britain which can be relied on. ‘I may venture to call it the original and true history of our island.’ These chasms in its annals would be much more to be regretted, in case the historical contents of this first book were of the substantial value Horsley supposes. In truth, very little information on what posterity cares most to know,—the amount of art and civilisation which the Romans had planted in Britain,—was to be gathered from professed historians. It is but small compensation, that the construction of the Walls by Hadrian and Antoninus, the battles round them, invasions from without, insurrections from within, conjectural years of turbulence and quiet, a proverbial fertility in tyrants, the deaths of Severus, A.D. 211, and of Constantius, *inter Divos relatus*, A.D. 306, both at York, military revolts and

contentions for the purple, may be all more or less faithfully recorded,—till the curtain drops over an apparent independence successfully asserted, and assistance afterwards supplicated for in vain. Most history, as hitherto written, has been the history of wars; and Anglo-Roman history has been mainly that of wars with the non-Romanised Britons. Our present inquiry, on the contrary, concerns peace and the works of peace, and the progressive influence of the Roman settlers on the Romanising population. The Romans here are seen in a new aspect, the memorials of which are not in books. From the departure of Constantine, the son of Constantius, for Rome, to become its first Christian emperor, down to the final withdrawal of the Roman legions from the island, there elapsed a period of nearly a century and a half. But long before the close, there were ominous signs that provincial Britain was sharing in the general decay of the empire. As the legions were gradually removed, it became clear that, whatever else the Romans had taught her, they had destroyed her native courage, and not relied sufficiently on her fidelity, to teach her the necessary art of self-defence. The storming of Rome by Alaric so shook the distant provinces, that the Saxon Chronicle says, ‘After this, the Romans never ruled in Britain.’ And nine years later (A. D. 418), an entry notices the first fleeing of the settlers from the misery to come. ‘This year the Romans collected all the treasures that were in Britain; and some they hid in the earth, so that no one since has been able to find them; and some they carried with them to Gaul.’ Meantime a ruling population must have been growing up of miscellaneous extraction, with provincial interests of their own, though with more or less of Roman training.

South of the Wall of Hadrian, however, the process of Romanising will have had ample time to become complete, both in character and appearance, before the withdrawal of a single soldier; so much so, that probably an Italian walking through the streets of *Londinium* or *Verulamium* might imagine himself in one of the cities of his native land. It was a part of the Roman policy to establish the troops who had effected the conquest in possession of the vanquished territory; and we learn by inscriptions and other records, that each legion and each auxiliary troop, held the same spot during the whole period that the Romans remained masters of the island. The inscriptions are always found in greatest abundance about the military towns; and they are especially valuable for the light they throw on the disposition and movements of the troops. Hundreds of them still lie buried under the ground which will some day add to our knowledge. The first Roman town in the island which was

dignified with the privileges of a *colonia*, *Camulodunum* (Colchester) was founded by disbanded veterans, perhaps those of the ninth legion. The Roman legions may indeed be considered as the principal colonists; they built the towns and stations, and have left their name on the bricks of which they were constructed. In many of these towns they were the chief proprietors of the land, which, as we find from their monumental inscriptions, passed from one generation to another by inheritance. When not engaged in war, they were actively employed in public works, and in cultivating the arts of peace. With their families and their relations and friends, they formed the mass of the inhabitants of many of the towns, especially of those on the frontiers.

The inscriptions which are continually found in excavating on these sites, and of which an interesting collection is given in the works at the head of the present article furnish an important supplement to the meagre details left us by the ancient historians. It appears from Tacitus that the four legions which went into Britain under Claudius, were the second, ninth, fourteenth, and twentieth. Of these the ninth was nearly destroyed in the war with Boadicea: we are told that it was recruited, and we know that it acted a conspicuous part in the Caledonian war under Agricola, — after which we hear no more of it in this country. The fourteenth legion was recalled under Nero, sent back to Britain by Vitellius, and finally recalled in the reign of Vespasian. But another legion, the sixth, was brought over by Hadrian, and this, with the second and twentieth, constituted the permanent garrison of the island. Agricola himself was commander of the twentieth legion, and it was probably the one most actively employed in the conquest of the Silures; it was stationed at *Deva* (Chester), where it has left a multitude of memorials. Nor are the traces less numerous of the second legion, which was stationed at *Isca* (Caerleon). The sixth legion had its head-quarters at *Eboracum* (York). We see at once the reason of this disposition of forces. The great military stations at Chester and Caerleon commanded at the same time the mountainous districts of Wales, and the coasts where the Irish pirates were accustomed to make their descents; while the former and that at York held in check the Caledonians, and the more turbulent British tribes on their border. Among the very numerous inscriptions found in the North, we trace the detachments as severally employed in the Caledonian wars, or in building the Walls and forts on the Caledonian frontier. All three legions served in Scotland under Lollius Urbicus, and co-operated in building the Wall of Anto-

nius, along the line of which many notices of them have been discovered, indicating the portions erected by each. Of the inscriptions comprised in Stuart's *Caledonia Romana*, thirteen commemorate the labours of the second legion, seven those of the sixth, and six those of the twentieth. An altar from near Carlisle, engraved in the work of Mr. Bruce, commemorates the exploits of two officers of the sixth legion, in the war against the Caledonians between the two Walls. On the line of Hadrian's Wall, inscriptions belonging to the second legion have been found, among other instances, at Milking Gap, between *Borcovicus* and *Vindolana*, at Headswood, at Bewcastle (*Apiatorium*), and at Netherby (*Castra exploratorum*). The sixth legion figures at Birdoswald (*Amboglanna*), at Tynemouth (*Ostia Vedræ*), and elsewhere; while among inscriptions appropriated to the twentieth legion, we may mention those from Cawfield's Craigs, from Chapel House, and from Middleby (*Blatum Bulgium*). One inscription at York mentions the ninth legion, and several found there refer to the second. One relating to the fourteenth legion was unearthed at Wroxeter, in Shropshire (*Uriconium*).

When we think of the Romans in Britain, we must not imagine that the mass of the conquerors and colonists were Romans in anything but the general appellation. On the contrary, the island was taken possession of by a strangely mixed population, and we can hardly figure to ourselves the singular physiognomy which it must have presented. The large garrisons of York, Chester, and Caerleon, were Romans, and Roman blood must have predominated in those and some other places; but the greater number of the Roman towns throughout the island were occupied by people draughted from almost every nation which acknowledged the supremacy of Rome. Thus, at Cirencester, there was a troop of Indians and another of Thracians, both cavalry. A party of Thracian cavalry was stationed at *Uriconium* in Shropshire. The troops stationed at *Coccium* in Lancashire, were Sarmatians and Asturians from Spain. But the best notion of this singular mixture of nations will be obtained from the following list of the military stations on Hadrian's Wall as given in the *Notitia*, corrected for the most part from the monuments by Horsley and Mr. Petrie and Mr. Bruce.

* The tribune of the fourth cohort of the Lingones at *Segedunum* (Wallsend).

The tribune of the cohort of the Cornovii at *Pons Ælii* (Newcastle).

The prefect of the first ala (or wing) of the Astures at *Condercum* (Banwell).

The tribune of the first cohort of the Frixagi at *Vindobala* (Rutchester).

The prefect of the Savinian ala at *Hunnum* (Halton-chester).

The prefect of the second ala of Astures at *Cilurnum* (Walwick Chesters).

The tribune of the first cohort of the Batavians at *Procolitia* (Carrawburgh).

The tribune of the first cohort of the Tungri at *Borcovicus* (Housesteads).

The tribune of the fourth cohort of the Gauls at *Vindolana* (Little Chesters or Chesterholm).

The tribune of the first cohort of the Astures at *Æsica* (Great Chesters).

The tribune of the second cohort of the Dalmatians at *Magna* in *Northumbria* (Carvorran).

The tribune of the first cohort of Dacians, styled *Ælia*, at *Ambo-glanna* (Burdoswald).

The prefect of the ala called Petriana, at *Petriana* (Camberfoot, or Castle Steeds).

The prefect of a detachment of Moors, styled Aureliani, at *Aballaba* (Watch Cross).

The tribune of the second cohort of the Lergi at *Congavata* (Stanwicks).

The tribune of the first cohort of the Spaniards at *Axelodunum* (Brough on the Sands).

The tribune of the second cohort of the Thracians at *Gabrosentis* (Drumburgh).

The tribune of the first marine cohort, styled *Ælia*, at *Tunnocelum* (Bowness).

The tribune of the first cohort of the Morini at *Glannibanta* (Cockermouth).

The tribune of the third cohort of the Nervii at *Alionis* (Whitley Castle, or Ambleside).

The cuneus of men in armour at *Bremetenracum* (Old Penrith, or Brampton).

The prefect of the first ala styled Herculean, at *Olenacum* (Old Carlisle, or Elenborough).

The tribune of the sixth cohort of the Nervii at *Virosidum* (Old Carlisle, or Elenborough).'

From the inscriptions found on the sites, it is proved that these were not moveable troops, sometimes quartered at one place and sometimes at another, but that each of them had been established in the town it occupied, from the time the town was first built to the date of the *Notitia*;—which was compiled not long before the final withdrawal of the Roman legions. Each station was a town, larger or smaller, according to circumstances, inhabited in great part by the families and countrymen of the soldiers to whom it belonged. Thus we have twenty-three towns, commencing with Wallsend (*Segedunum*) and Newcastle (*Pons Ælii*) on the Tyne, and stretching across the island, among which we

find, on the suspicious policy of universal conquest, no two consecutive towns belonging to people of the same nation. If we begin with *Vindolana*, we have a town of Gauls, then one of Asturians, next, a town of Dalmatians, and so in succession, Dacians, Moors, Lergi, (from what country is uncertain,) Spaniards, and Thracians. Probably all these different populations had adopted Roman manners; it is at least certain that among the numerous articles found on the sites they occupied, everything is purely Roman. Most of them, however, seem to have brought with them the religion and worship which they had learnt from their forefathers; and strange indeed must have been the variety of religious creeds existing contemporaneously in this island under Roman sway. Excavations on Roman sites have in general been rich in monuments of religious worship. Almost every town appears to have had its temples and altars to the chief deities of Rome; but with these we find a singular mixture of Eastern deities, and gods from Africa, from Germany, from Gaul, and from other countries. We learn from an inscription at York, that a legate of the sixth legion built in Eburacum a temple dedicated to Serapis. The same place has also contributed a monument relating to the worship of Mithras, and another dedicated to the *deæ matres*, or popular deities, 'of Africa, Italy, and Gaul.' The god Belatucadrus, (probably a Syrian deity, if not the same as Mars,) was adored on the banks of the Irthing in Cumberland, and at Netherby in Westmoreland. At Chester, there was a god who is described in the inscription by a mixed Roman and Barbaric name, Jupiter Tanaros, supposed to be the Teutonic Thunr or Thor. A cohort of Dacians in Cumberland worshipped a deity named Cocidius. An altar has been found at Netherby dedicated *Deo Mogonti*; and one or two in the county of Durham, dedicated *Deo Vitiri*,—whom Horsley calls a local Deity worshipped in this country. At *Corstopitum* (Corbridge in Northumberland) have been found altars inscribed in Greek to the Tyrian Hercules and to Astarte.

The numerous inscriptions discovered in the stations on the line of the Roman Wall and public roads by Mr. Bruce, place in a strong light this variety of worship prevailing among the Romano-British towns. Altars to Jupiter, Mars, Minerva, &c., prevail everywhere, and all nations seem to have agreed in giving the first honour to them as the deities of all-conquering Rome. At the station of Maryport, on the Solway Firth, a remarkably ornamented altar was found bearing the following inscription:—

' GENIO LOCI	' To the genius of the place,
FORTVNÆ REDVCI	to returning fortune,
ROMÆ ÆTERNÆ	to eternal Rome,
ET FATO BONO	and to propitious fate,
GAIVS CORNELIVS	Gaius Cornelius
PEREGRINVS	Peregrinus,
TRIBVNVS COHORTIS	tribune of a cohort
EX PROVINCIA	from the province of
MAVRITANLÆ CÆSARIENSIS. . . .'	Mauritania Cæsariensis. . . .'

Two imperfect lines which follow seem to state that Peregrinus had restored a temple to these divinities. He was, perhaps, the officer of the Moors stationed at *Aballaba* (Watchcross). 'Peregrinus,' says Mr. Bruce, 'addresses first the deity of the place over which his arms had triumphed; lest the local god should not smile benignantly, he resorts to Fortune, who had conducted him safely to the land of his adoption; if this deity should fail him, he thinks to find a refuge in the genius of the eternal city: but driven from that resource, there is nothing for it, but to trust to fate or chance.' Fortune seems to have been rather a favourite deity among the stations on the Wall; and it appears that many of the nations brought together to colonise this district adored the sun under different characters. Mithras, indeed, evidently was popular everywhere. A Mithraic cave at Housesteads (*Borcovicus*, occupied by the Tungri), contained altars and various implements of worship. Several of the altars were dedicated to Mithras by name. Another sculpture also relating to the same deity was found at *Cilurnum*, a post of the Astures: while a slab at Carvoran contained a poetical declaration of the belief of the dedicator in the Syrian goddess. Carvoran occupies the site of the Roman *Magna*, the post of the Dalmatian cohort. At Birdoswald (*Amboglanna*), the hunters of the Dacian cohort had erected an altar to Silvanus, the divinity of the woods. At Risingham (*Habitancum*), a small altar, put up by some soldier, to the nymphs, with the following not very intelligible inscription, has outlived more valuable memorials, —

'Somnio præmonitus miles hanc ponere jussit
Aram quæ Fabio nupta est Nymphis venerandis.'

An altar found at Rutchester (*Vindobala*), was dedicated to the gods of the mountains. Others at Thirlwall Castle, and at Benwell (*Condercum*), were dedicated to the god Vitres or Viteres, which is explained as perhaps referring to the Scandinavian Vithirs or Odin. Another at the former of these places informs us of the existence of a *dea Hamia*, while several altars along this line of towns bear witness to the favour with which the *deæ matres* were regarded.

One circumstance cannot fail to strike us forcibly in considering this strange mythological catalogue, so much apparently out of place. Among the multitude of monuments relating to the worship of the inhabitants of Britain under the Romans — among the immense number of Roman sepulchral interments which have been opened and examined—we have records of almost every religion of the heathen world, but we find not the slightest trace of Christianity. It must be borne in mind that all these temples and altars were standing, and their worship, no doubt, in full vigour, at the time when the Romans abandoned the island. We can hardly doubt but, that in the constant intercourse with Rome, some traveller or some soldier, who had received the Christian doctrines, must from time to time have found his way hither; yet we feel fully justified by the circumstance just mentioned in believing that the faith of the Gospel had not established itself in Roman Britain. How contrary is this to the bold averments of the old Ecclesiastical writers, who would lead us to imagine that the Romans left Britain covered with churches and divided into bishops' sees! And how conformable to the statement that Augustine did not find a single Christian either among the Romans or the Saxons in the South of England!

Our information on the condition of the Roman towns in Britain is as yet very scanty, but we may hope for further information as our researches are continued. Some of the inscriptions now known speak of municipal officers, and of trade colleges or guilds. Many speak of the erection or restoration of temples, baths, and other public buildings. An inscription at Caerleon, engraved by Mr. Lec, commemorates the rebuilding of the barracks; and an inscription at Lanchester in Durham (*Epiacum*), records the building of public baths and a basilica. The Roman towns, with the exception of the military stations, were not for some time protected by walls; a circumstance indicating a sense of security beyond what we should have expected. Such we learn from the history of Boadicea's revolt, had been the case at first with *Camulodunum*, *Verulamium*, and *Londinium*, all which cities were surrounded at a later period with walls of a very massive character. Discoveries made from time to time in London, show us the Roman town gradually increasing from a comparatively small place till it filled the whole space of the present city; and it was only after it had reached this magnitude that the walls were erected. Even then, like most other stations placed in a similar position, it had no wall towards the river; but some excavations near the Thames have brought to light the remains of a wall evidently erected towards the decline of Roman rule; probably after some attack by water from the

Saxon pirates, as it appears to have been built hurriedly with stones from ruined temples and other public buildings. *Londinium* seems to have been the chief seat of government, and casual excavations have discovered buildings of extraordinary extent and gorgeously decorated, especially in its north-eastern quarter. It was not a military station; though among the few monumental inscriptions found here two are commemorative of soldiers of the second and twentieth legions, individuals perhaps belonging to the body-guard of the governor of the province.*

When we are unable to judge by any other circumstances of the comparative riches and importance of the Roman towns or villas in Britain, there are two distinctive characteristics which present themselves immediately, and in general without any extensive excavations, — the tessellated pavements, and the pottery. The red ware, to which the name of Samian has been applied, and which is usually ornamented with figures in relief, was certainly imported from the continent; and there are good reasons for believing that it was costly. The absence of Samian ware and of tessellated pavements may, therefore, be regarded as one evidence of poverty. It is singular, accordingly, that we find scarcely any pavements in Kent, and that its villas should not appear to have been much ornamented. No pavements of any beauty have been discovered along the line of Hadrian's Wall, nor is Samian ware frequent in that district. At Ribchester in Lancashire, the red pottery occurs in abundance, and in all probability *Coccium* was a rich town. There are some good pavements, too, in Yorkshire, as we might expect in the neighbourhood of the second city in the island.† But the country of magnificent pavements extended over Gloucestershire, Somersetshire, Wiltshire, and Hampshire, into Sussex, and northward through Oxfordshire and Northamptonshire. This was the fashionable part of the island under the Romans, and the

* The few London inscriptions now known have been collected and engraved by Mr. Roach Smith, in his 'Collectanea Antiqua.' They were nearly all found in the neighbourhood of Ludgate Street which was the principal road out of *Londinium*; and the sepulchral monuments appear to have stood on each side of it. The site of the Fleet Prison, if dug deep enough, will probably furnish additional monuments of this class.

† Several very elegant Roman tessellated pavements found in Yorkshire, have been recently engraved and published by Mr. Ecroyd Smith, of York; a gentleman who, although, we believe, walking in a comparatively humble path of life, has devoted both time and money to illustrate the antiquities of his country.

medicinal baths of *Aquæ Solis* (Bath) appear to have been the centre of a district covered with handsome mansions, and stretching uninterruptedly to the bathing towns on the southern coast. The towns in this part of Britain were distinguished by the same characteristics as the country villas; and we need only refer our readers to the work of Professor Buckman and Mr. Newmarch to convince them of the splendour and riches of ancient *Corinium*.

Very little has been hitherto written on the manufactures of this country under the Romans, and it is not till lately that the researches of antiquaries were at all directed to this subject. Mr. Roach Smith has found in London traces of the woollen manufacture; and there can be no doubt that many articles of other kinds in common use were made in the island. The great mass of ordinary pottery was formed of the clay of the banks of the Medway, on what are now called the Upchurch Marshes, not very far above Sheerness. Over an extent of several miles, at a depth of from two to three feet, one continued layer, in some places more than a foot thick, of Roman pottery has been exhumed. It exists both broken and whole, but chiefly broken; and is evidently the damaged refuse of immense manufactories, in activity from the earliest to the latest period of Roman rule. There are traces of similar works in the neighbourhood of Dymchurch, on the southern coast of Kent. To the late Mr. Artis we owe the discovery, at Castor in Northamptonshire (*Durobrivæ*), of potteries which furnished vessels of a more ornamental description, with figures in relief, exhibiting considerable artistic skill. In this instance not only the pottery but the kilns were found in a perfect state. *Durobrivæ* was evidently a flourishing town, and its manufacturers most likely, of a superior class to those at Upchurch and Dymchurch. Mr. Artis uncovered numerous houses, many of which presented very handsome pavements and remains of frescoed walls, and he gathered together numerous articles which showed the affluence of the former inhabitants. All these formed the subjects of a series of large engravings, published at the expense of the late Earl Fitzwilliam, but which unfortunately were left without a descriptive text.* In speaking of the

* E. Tyrell Artis was a self-educated man, who, by his zeal in antiquarian and scientific pursuits, attracted the attention of Earl Fitzwilliam and Lord Holland, as well as of the old Duke of Bedford. The two former noblemen procured his election as a member of the Antiquarian and Geological Societies, and paid the expenses of making him a life member. He wanted facility in committing his ideas to

industrial establishments of the Romans, we ought not, perhaps, to overlook several rather considerable manufactories of forged coins, which have been found at Edington in Somersetshire, at Lingwell-gate near Wakefield in Yorkshire, and at one or two other places. Among the exports of Roman Britain were iron, lead, and tin; but the antiquities of the districts which produced these metals have not yet been carefully investigated. Pigs of lead, with the Roman imperial mark, as though the mines were the immediate property of the emperor, have been frequently found in spots, where they seem to have been accidentally left when on their way to the coast for exportation. The principal iron districts under the Romans were, the forest of Dean and its neighbourhood in Gloucestershire, and the wealds of Kent and Sussex. In these localities the country for miles is covered with beds of scoriæ, which are proved to be Roman by the frequent occurrence of Roman pottery and other articles. Their process of smelting was, however, so imperfect, that in modern times smelters have often found it more profitable to recommit the old scoriæ to the furnace, than to dig for fresh ore. Traces of lead and iron works are found in Northumberland, and are described in Mr. Bruce's interesting volume.

‘In Allendale and Alston Moor numerous masses of ancient scoriæ have been found, which must have resulted from the reduction of lead from its ore. In the station of Corchester, portions of lead pipe have been found. It is an inch and a half in diameter, and has been formed by bending round a flat strip of the metal, and soldering the joint. Iron has been produced in large quantities. In the neighbourhood of *Habitancum* masses of iron slag have been found. It is heavier than what proceeds from modern furnaces, in consequence, probably, of the imperfect reduction of the ore. In the neighbourhood of Lanchester the process seems to have been carried on very extensively. On the division of the common, two large heaps were removed, the one containing about four hundred cart loads of dross, the other six hundred. It was used in the construction of some new roads which were then formed; a purpose for which it was admirably adapted. During the operation of bringing this common into cultivation, the method adopted by the Romans of producing the blast necessary to smelt the metal was made apparent. Two tunnels had been formed in the side of a hill; they were wide at one extremity, but tapered off to a narrow bore at the other, where they met in a point. The mouths of the channels opened towards the west, from

writing, which is the reason we have no text to his plates of the antiquities of *Durobrivæ*; and we believe the only explanation of them now existing is in the possession of Mr. Roach Smith, who took notes of them from the mouth of Mr. Artis.

which quarter a prevalent wind blows in this valley, and sometimes with great violence. The blast received by them would, when the wind was high, be poured with considerable force and effect upon the smelting furnaces at the extremity of the tunnels.'

A still more remarkable fact (often questioned, but established by Mr. Bruce's researches) is the use of mineral coal by the Romans in Britain : —

'In nearly all the stations of the line, the ashes of mineral fuel have been found; in some a store of unconsumed coal has been met with, which, though intended to give warmth to the primeval occupants of the isthmus, has been burnt in the grates of the modern English. In several places the source whence the mineral was procured can be pointed out; but the most extensive workings that I have heard of are in the neighbourhood of Grindon Lough, near Sewingshields. Not long ago a shaft was sunk, with the view of procuring the coal which was supposed to be below the surface; the projector soon found that, though coal had been there, it was all removed. The ancient workings stretched beneath the bed of the lake.'

Enough, perhaps, has been said to show the interesting character of the recent discoveries relating to Roman Britain, many of which are laid before the public in the volumes we are reviewing. It must, however, be remembered, that nearly all made hitherto have been merely accidental; and that, with very rare exceptions, we have had no extensive and well-directed excavations. For this purpose a conjunction of two conditions, which are not always found together, is required — the opportunity of working, and the money to work with. In some cases the circumstances of the ground will not allow it to be excavated; and in others, though much less numerous, the proprietor of the ground has discountenanced the interference of the antiquary. This must be the reason of railways having been, as we learn from Mr. Wilson, a principal means of antiquarian discovery in Scotland. Much the same indeed has been the case in England. The want of the necessary funds is a still greater impediment, and one which it is not always possible to overcome. Nearly all the books before us put forward claims of this kind. At Cirencester, we believe that for weeks together hardly a day has passed without something new coming to light, which shows how much might be gained by more extensive and systematic excavations; and an appeal has been made through the press for subscriptions to enable the local antiquaries to undertake them. At Caerleon the necessary works have generally been carried on by the proprietors of the ground, with the aid of a subscription for building and arranging a museum. But the fund being exhausted before the work was completed, its insufficiency appears to have cast a damp on the ardour of the neighbourhood;

and Mr. Lee also is obliged to appeal to a wider public. About three years ago an accidental discovery led to some excavations at *Verulamium* (St. Albans); and these soon laid bare the remains of a Roman theatre,—the only building of the kind yet met with in this country. A small sum of money was collected, but quite inadequate for the purpose. In consequence of which, after a considerable portion of the building had been exposed to view, the material was carried away, and the earth thrown in again; and the spot is, we believe, marked at present only by a flourishing crop of turnips. A pamphlet printed by Mr. Grove Lowe, the intelligent director of the excavations, is the sole more appropriate memorial of it now remaining. It is clear that subscriptions by private individuals will never suffice for the numerous demands which the lately awakened spirit of national research is making upon us. If a rich and chartered body, like the London Society of Antiquaries, were resolved to carry out the promise of its title, it could do something towards making these dry bones live again, both in encouraging and assisting; but in the meantime we will only mention, as a proof how far that body is from taking the lead at present, that of the gentlemen to whom we owe the valuable publications enumerated in the earlier part of our article, one only, Mr. Roach Smith, adds F. S. A. to his name. Much might be accomplished by noble and wealthy proprietors of historic sites in their individual capacities—fully as much by their example as by their success; though the site of many could not fail to reward the adventurer in these scientific ‘diggings.’ Ribchester, for instance, may safely be recommended to Lord de Tabley, who, if we mistake not, possesses sufficient literary and antiquarian taste for the undertaking. It would alone furnish a local museum of the highest interest. The example set by the Hon. Mr. Neville at Chesterford in Essex, and in its neighbourhood, ought to find imitators. Permission has, we understand, been given for the most extensive excavations at Pevensey, and other places, as well as at *Verulamium*; but local antiquarian societies are not rich enough to undertake them. A careful inquiry into the area of Pevensey would probably set at rest the much debated question of its identity with the Roman *Anderida*. We cannot help thinking that the English Government might lay aside from the public money a small sum yearly for purposes of this kind. Doing so, it would only be following in the track of almost every government in Europe.* Mr. Roach Smith car-

* The republican government of France has not been wanting in a proper feeling for the antiquarian monuments of the country.

nestly solicited assistance from the Treasury, towards the excavations at Lymne (the *Portus Lemanis*), but without effect.

Few spots would better repay excavation than the towns and stations along the line of Hadrian's Wall, the ruins of which, from the wildness of the district, have been less disturbed than most other places. They have suffered chiefly in very recent times from local improvements made by men who did not trouble themselves about the remains of antiquity. Although we often listen with regret to Mr. Bruce's account of the depredations to which these monuments have been exposed from the vandalism of the last hundred years, he astonishes us by his descriptions of what still survives; and we cannot but feel a strong desire to see something farther of localities of which in a former lecture on this subject he assured us, that 'some excavations recently made at *Cilurnum* and *Borcovicus* show us that, were the requisite skill and labour bestowed, we might in our own land walk in Roman streets, and traverse Roman temples, little inferior in interest to those of Pompeii.' In the book we have now in our hand Mr. Bruce tells us of Housesteads (*Borcovicus*):—

"This," says Gordon, "is unquestionably the most remarkable and magnificent station in the whole island;" and "it is hardly credible what a number of august remains of the Roman grandeur is to be seen here to this day, seeing in every place where one casts his eye there is some curious Roman antiquity to be seen: either the marks of streets and temples in ruins, or inscriptions, broken pillars, statues, and other pieces of sculpture, all scattered along the ground." Stukeley, in the vehemence of his admiration, denominates it "The Tadmor of Britain." Let not the visitor, however, approach it with expectations too greatly excited. There is very much to admire, but not a great deal to strike the eye at first sight. The altars and sculptured figures which lay in profusion on the ground when Gordon and Stukeley were there, have been removed, but the ruins of the place remain as complete and vast as ever. The city is, in a great measure, covered with its own debris, but the ex-

On the 8th of February last the National Assembly voted, without discussion and almost unanimously, the sum of sixty-one thousand francs, for repairing and restoring the Roman amphitheatre at Arles, — a sum quite sufficient to uncover and bring to light half-a-dozen Roman towns in this country. An accidental occasion for very extensive discoveries has just arisen, which we trust will not be neglected by our local antiquaries. We allude to the new sanitary law. When the new system of sewerage is brought into operation in cities and towns which occupy Roman sites, such as Lincoln, Canterbury, Leicester, &c., the excavators will in all probability reach the Roman level: their proceedings must therefore be carefully watched.

cavations which have recently been made show us that when they are continued throughout the entire station, the ancient *Borcovicus* will be the Pompeii of Britain.'

Of Chesters (*Cilurnum*) Mr. Bruce tells us:—

'This station has, as usual, the form of a parallelogram, the corners being rounded off. It contains an area of fully six acres. In the latter part of the last century, when the mansion and estate of Chesters came into the possession of the family of Clayton, this area was covered with the ruins of buildings which had apparently stood in straight, narrow streets; and although the surface of the station has since been levelled and made smooth, in order to fit it for its use as part of the Park, yet its ramparts and fosse, the wall and vallum as they approach and leave it, and the road leading to the river, may all be distinctly discerned; even the ruined dwellings of the interior area, as if dissatisfied with their lowly condition, struggle to rear themselves into notice.'

From the north let us turn our attention southward to the series of fortresses, whose history has been treated with so much ability by Mr. Roach Smith. When Mr. Smith found his appeal to Government, in the case of Lyme, ineffectual, he first raised a small sum of money among his immediate friends and acquaintances so as to commence the excavations, and then threw himself upon the public. In this instance the public responded sufficiently to enable him and his colleague, Mr. Elliott, of Dymchurch, to prosecute their researches with great effect. Richborough (*Rutupiæ*) has been excavated to some extent by the liberality of Mr. Rolfe, of Sandwich. Reculver (*Regulbium*) has been excavated only by the sea; but that agent has discovered much, which will help to illustrate more especially the period when the Roman influence merged into that of the Saxons. *Rutupiæ* is well known in history as the principal port by which Roman Britain was entered from Gaul, and consequently from Rome. The lofty and massive walls of its citadel still remain almost entire: while, the numerous pieces of sculptured white marble and other materials which are continually found in the area within, prove that it once contained public buildings of importance. Indeed, it still contains one building of great magnitude, the object of which no antiquary has yet been able to explain, although it no doubt served some end connected with the position of the place as the chief seaport in Britain. In the middle of the area of the *Castrum* is a rectangular platform, a hundred and forty-five feet long, by a hundred and four wide. In 1822 an excavation ascertained the singular fact that beneath this platform there existed an extensive subterranean edifice with no traces of an entrance

to it. Its discoverer conceived the idea of making one under the wall. But, after sinking a shaft to the depth of about twenty-two feet, without finding the bottom of the wall, he was compelled by springs to abandon his operations. The platform extends beyond the walls of this subterranean edifice on the longer side twelve feet, and on the shorter ten; so that the extent of the subterranean works on the exterior is a hundred and thirty-three feet by ninety-four. In the autumn of 1843, Mr. Rolfe made excavations round the building, in the hope of finding an entrance under the platform; and he spent two months in the vain attempt to penetrate through the solid mass of the wall. We expect that, if the entrance be ever found, it will be by clearing away the earth and rubbish from the surface of the platform. Mr. Smith observes, 'that the subterranean building was constructed for some extraordinary and important purpose is obvious from the fact, that nothing at all analogous to it has been discovered at any of the Roman stations in this country, or, as far as can be ascertained, on the Continent. It would therefore appear that this extensive and peculiar structure was built for some great public object connected with the locality, which, as has been already shown, was the chief line of transit to and from Britain. It may not, therefore, be unreasonable to suppose that a place of such strength and security may have served as an arsenal for arms and other military equipments; and it may also have been used as a receptacle for provisions for the troops in emergencies, as well as a temporary and occasional storehouse for corn.' In the anxiety to obtain some insight into the character of this building, the traces of the town of *Rutupiæ*, which seems to have lain over the fields in the north and north-west of the fortress, have been rather neglected. The latest of Mr. Rolfe's discoveries, as recorded in Mr. Smith's book, is a Roman amphitheatre on the summit of the hill, to the south of the station, which was unexpectedly found to have been surrounded with walls.

The excavations at Lynne have been going on steadily since the publication of Mr. Smith's book, and have only been partially interrupted during the winter. In most of the Roman towns and stations the large tiles of the construction are stamped with the name of the legions which built them; but the tiles or bricks at Lynne bear the inscription CLBR, in rather late characters. This Mr. Smith explains with great plausibility, as signifying *Classici* or *classiarii Britannici*, — the British marines. In fact, the great number of coins of Carausius found here, in proportion to those of other emperors,

leave little doubt but that the *Portus Lemanis* was a principal station of that usurper's fleet. At a subsequent period, perhaps, no longer back than the eleventh or twelfth century, a land-slip must have overthrown the principal entrance and many parts of the walls. It has so much disturbed the interior, that in some parts no traces can be found of the buildings which once stood within; and in others they are lying in such confusion that it is impossible to make out their original plan. The bare walls of some very extensive edifice have been traced in the upper part of the area; and a large house, in a tolerably perfect state, has been uncovered in the south-east corner, eight or nine rooms of which are now opened. Further excavations must uncover other remains, and we may expect ere long to be made better acquainted with the character of this once important town.

These southern fortresses point more particularly to the later period of the Roman occupation of Britain, concerning which history leaves us entirely in the dark. The foes with whom Roman Britain had at this time to contend were its old assailants, the Caledonians, — or, as they were now called, the Picts and Scots, — in the north, and those new assailants, who, under the general appellation of Saxons, were infesting its south-eastern coasts. At the time to which the 'Notitia Imperii' refers, *i. e.* the earlier years of the fifth century, the twentieth legion appears to have been withdrawn from the island, and the second legion had been moved from *Isca* to *Rutupiæ*; but the sixth legion still remained stationed at York, and exactly the same troops held the towns on the northern border who had occupied them from the first. This last circumstance proves that down to the date in question the inroads of the Caledonians had produced no permanent effect; though A.D. 396 is supposed to be the year of the first embassy by the Britons to Rome for succour, and of the sending over of a legion to them by Stilicho. The mixture of races and religions as planted in Britain by the Roman Conquest naturally produced a ruling population, which sympathised neither with the vanquished natives nor with their distant Roman masters, and which had now adopted the island of the western ocean as their only home. They frequently challenged their independence, and elected emperors for themselves. When Rome at last withdrew its legions, it only conceded to this population that right of providing for its own government, which it had so often asserted before.

The condition of Britain under the Romans, might perhaps be compared with that of Ireland as it existed under En-

glish rule no very long time ago. The towns were entirely peopled by the conquerors: they alone were capable of holding municipal privileges or power: and the country was covered with the houses of gentry and landholders, who were all either descended from the old conquerors or new settlers. The peasantry only were British,—that class who were in ancient times equally slaves under one race of rulers or another, and who were only spurred into insurrection by political agitators or by foreign invasions. The destruction of one half of the Brigantes by Lollius Urbicus — which no doubt annihilated the chiefs of the tribe — is a fact made known to us only by accident; though we cannot doubt but that similar events must have occurred repeatedly in other parts of the country, until probably scarcely any of the British aristocracy was left. Still, as in Ireland, the peasantry, having no attachment to their lords, were easily excited to revolt; and a successful inroad of the Caledonians would always be attended by a corresponding agitation among the Britons. Let us look at the state of the county of Wexford in the rebellion of 1798, and we shall have an exact picture of what Britain must have been under the later inroads of the Picts and Scots. When the latter succeeded in penetrating into the interior of the country, the British peasantry no doubt rose in every direction, not with any united plan or object, but for the mere purpose of sharing in the plunder and devastation. It was the principle of the military force of the towns rather to defend their several homes than to join with one another in one common effort. When they were taken by surprise and the legions were not at hand to oppose the insurrection in the field, they shut themselves up within their walls: and left the invaders and insurgents to range over the country at will, burning the houses of the gentry and slaughtering all who had not succeeded in making their escape. We find abundant traces of these devastations in the remains of Roman villas, which are from time to time uncovered by the excavations of antiquaries, and which present all the marks of having been burnt in a hostile inroad. Here and there, as in the Wexford insurrection in Ireland, towns, when too weak to resist, or which were delivered up by treason, will have shared the fate of private houses. Proof of this occurs in our subterraneous researches. The northern invaders appear to have entered usually by the western extremity of the Wall, where they were perhaps joined by marauders from Hibernia. In their way south, upon more than one occasion they must have taken by storm the Roman town which occupied the site now called Maryport. Mr. Bruce informs us from Lysons what aspect it pre-

sented, upon a partial excavation during the last century. 'The workmen found the arch of the gate beat violently down and broken; and, on entering the great street, discovered evident marks of the houses having been more than once burnt to the ground and rebuilt: an event not unlikely to have happened on so exposed a frontier. The streets had been paved with broad flag-stones, much worn by use, particularly the steps into a vaulted room, supposed to have been a temple. The houses had been roofed with Scotch slates, which, with the pegs which fastened them, lay confusedly in the streets. Glass vessels, and even mirrors were found, and coals had evidently been used in the fire-places.' In one of the last incursions of the barbarians, the town of *Coccium* had experienced a similar fate. Dr. Whitaker gives the following account of excavations in its modern representative, Ribchester. 'The inscribed flag-stone found in 1811 having sufficiently proved the existence of a temple, further search was determined upon, and, in the summer of 1813, leave having been obtained to dig in the adjoining gardens between the river and the churchyard, the first appearances, at the depth of about three feet, were a stratum of charcoal, evidently formed by the conflagration of the roof, and nearly in the centre a cavity in the earth had been made, by the uniting of the ends of the beams at their fall, large enough to contain a man sitting. Beneath this was a confused mass of large amphoræ, some almost entire at first, and many beautiful remnants of pateræ in the red Samian ware, mingled with which lay several human skeletons, all of the largest size, in every direction. Every appearance about the place indicated that it had been taken by storm, and that the defenders had been buried in the ruins of the roof.' We seem to be reading the story of the capture of *Camulodunum* by the Britons under Boadicea, when the veterans were destroyed in their last asylum—the temple of Claudius.

For many years before they abandoned the island, the Roman rulers had been courting the alliance of the Saxons,—partly perhaps to avoid their hostility—and had no doubt allowed them to settle on the coast extending from the south of Kent to the Wash; for this, we think, is implied in the term *littus Saxonicum*, which the Romans now applied to it. Anti-quarian discoveries in these districts seem to show that the Saxons lived there intermixed with the Roman population; partook their manner of life; were buried side by side with them; and succeeded them as citizens. There are many reasons for believing that, when the Roman legions withdrew

from the island, *Rutupiæ*, *Regulbium*, and the other fortresses on the Saxon coast, were left in possession of Saxon soldiers. At Richborough and the adjoining districts are chiefly found the coins which numismatists have termed *minimi*, and which seem to be very early Saxon copies of the Roman money. The Saxons were certainly in peaceful possession of the fortresses of East Kent and of Canterbury itself, at the earliest period to which we can trace them by their own writers. Thus a new element was brought into the general population, on the same footing with the population of the Roman towns. The Saxons could soon bring assistance from abroad, better fitted perhaps to contend with Pict and Scot even than the Roman legionaries, but their success naturally led to a struggle for power between them and the towns. The latter would often have their separate interests; and would thus be induced to form separate leagues and confederacies, which would expose them to the Saxons in detail. Besides, many of the auxiliary cohorts established in Britain had been drawn from different parts of Germany; and these would readily fraternise with the new comers. It is evident that the hostilities to which this new state of things gave rise, were of long duration; for the towns themselves had been used to war, and (unlike the later Britons) wanted neither the skill nor the spirit to defend themselves. In course of time some, taken by assault, were plundered and destroyed; others sought terms and surrendered upon condition, acknowledging the absolute sovereignty of the Saxon chiefs, but preserving internally their own municipal existence and laws, — which will have thus become the foundation of our corporate towns. The Roman population was no longer recruited from abroad, and therefore it gradually died away or merged into the Saxon race. The rich and powerful city of London must often have been attacked; but it seems to have repulsed its assailants, and to have preserved its independence after all the other towns had succumbed. Like the city of Paris among the Franks, it appears to have stood among the Anglo-Saxon States, without submitting to the sovereignty of any of them, — a free-trading corporation, which only acknowledged the supremacy of the monarch when, at a much later period, the various Saxon kingdoms had merged into one.

Such is the history of the Romans in Britain, as far as it can be made out at present from the monuments which modern antiquaries have disinterred. The books before us are well calculated to show the importance of these researches, and how interesting a prospect of increasing knowledge they are opening to us.

Sir F. Palgrave has already made excellent use of the discoveries which preceded the date of his English Commonwealth, in the chapter where he describes the condition of the country as a Roman province. His account of the Roman buildings is very striking, and some of our readers may be surprised at their size and duration. 'The country was replete with the monuments of Roman magnificence. Malsbury appeals to those stately ruins as testimonies of the favour which Britain had enjoyed; the towers, the temples, the theatres, and the baths, which yet remained undestroyed, excited the wonder and admiration of the chronicler and the traveller; and even in the fourteenth century, the edifices raised by the Romans were so numerous and costly, as almost to excel any others on this side of the Alps. Nor were these structures amongst the least influential means of establishing the Roman power. Architecture, as cultivated by the ancients, was not merely presented to the eye; the art spake also to the mind. The walls, covered with the decrees of the legislature, engraved on bronze or sculptured in the marble; the triumphal arches, crowned by the statues of the princes who governed the province from the distant quirinal; the tessellated floor, pictured with the mythology of the State, whose sovereign was its pontiff; all contributed to act upon the feelings of the people, and to impress them with respect and submission; the conquered shared in the fame, and were exalted by the splendour of the victors.' Sir F. Palgrave is equally confident in his political conclusions; 'As the fragments of the capital and the mutilated cornice, enable us to judge that the forum of "Aquæ Solis," was surrounded by edifices, erected according to the rules which were exemplified at Treves or Arles; so with an equal degree of moral certainty, we are enabled to reconstruct the fabric of the State, from vestiges of institutions, which formed part of a consistent and uniform plan.'

Sir James Mackintosh, however, in a calmer tone, if with less appropriate knowledge, warns us not to draw too wide an inference from the character of the buildings of the Romans in Britain, any more than from that of their military roads. 'The Roman remains' (he says) 'seem rather to indicate the luxury of the military stations, than any desire to adorn their province by civil architecture. . . . Roman cultivation was extended to it in a less degree than Spain or Gaul. The writers of the latter province were respectable. Those of the former, the most famous of their age. Roman Britain did not produce a single literary name.' The notion that the *causidici Britanni* might have made sufficient progress

to be taking their standard of eloquence from Roman Gaul, was only food for satire in the age of Juvenal. What benefits our ancestors may have derived at a later day from either Norman lawyers or the institutions and laws of Rome is a distinct question. It is probably true, that we are tasting the fruits at this day, of the imperial care in providing for the government and privileges of towns. 'Thirty-three towns, or rather townships, were established in this island from Winchester to Inverness, with various constitutions and stages of dignity . . . and it cannot be doubted that the remembrance and remains of them, contributed to the formation or preservation of those elective governments in towns, which were the foundations of liberty among modern nations.' When we remember that most of the barbaric conquerors of the west entrusted the preparation of their codes of law to Roman lawyers; and are reminded also, that Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, born A.D. 639, had studied Roman law at York, and that there is a description of the same school by Alcuin, in 804, we surely may conclude, — that a system so universally popular was more widely studied in England at this early period, and must have had a more positive influence upon early English law, than our legal antiquaries have as yet had the industry or candour to identify. 'A province in which Papinian presided, must have been familiar with Roman law.'

ART. VIII. — *History of Greece*. By GEORGE GROTE, Esq.
Vols. VII. and VIII. 1850. 8vo.

MR. GROTE has only advanced two volumes since we last spoke with him: but most readers, we think, will feel that the progress he has really made is very considerable. It is not that he has despatched a larger portion of time within the same compass: on the contrary, the narrative lengthens perceptibly as it proceeds, and the eighth volume, originally proposed as the limit of the whole work, terminates at a point which stands but little more than half way in the story as treated by its last exponent, Bishop Thirlwall. But the interest of a history is not to be measured by space of time: and the writer who has to follow Thucydides* at the distance of two

* Mr. Cobden, not many months since, talked to his hearers at the Manchester Athenæum about 'the whole of the historical works of Thucydides.' As he professed to weigh this voluminous cargo, in respect of its practical utility to an Englishman of the present day,

thousand years, may be excused if his own necessities, no less than those of his subject, induce him to indulge in expansion. Mr. Grote's last *livraison* concluded with the first stage of the Peloponnesian War: the present publication conducts us through the remaining, and much more eventful part of that mighty struggle, down to the death of the man whose name is, more than that of any other, identified with it. Grecian history had now at length begun to acquire that fulness of political significance which renders it, in the prophetic language of its great eye-witness, a possession for all time. Previously to the age of Pericles its embodiment was more or less romantic, its reality a matter for abstract discussion and critical deduction, its most faithful contemporary record the prose epic of Herodotus, its best modern exposition works of a Niebuhrian character, where the story-teller is constantly obliged to merge himself in the essayist. After that date it assumes a real and life-like concreteness, as tangible now as it was during the acting of it; while a philosophical narrative is made possible not only by the credibility, but by the intrinsic nature of the events related, which are felt at once to belong to times akin to these latter days of our own. We are anxious to call attention *in limine* to the deep interest of the period, not merely for its own sake, but because we are not likely to recur to it at any length. Mr. Grote's subject is the 'Peloponnesian War: ours is not the Peloponnesian War, but Mr. Grote's History.

At first sight it may appear that where a history thus as it were relates itself, the praise of the historian must necessarily be diminished. Such an inference, however, would be as unfair in the light of a general remark, as it would be obviously untrue in the particular instance of the present work. Because a story is able to force itself on the attention in spite of its narrator, it by no means follows that it can gain nothing from the manner in which it is conveyed: while, on the other hand, there will always be something unreal and unsatisfactory in the employment of high talent to glorify an uninteresting or unworthy subject. Mr. Grote complains, feelingly, in his Preface of 'the insufficiency of written materials,' not only as 'compelling him 'to leave much of his picture an absolute blank,' but as 'greatly 'spoiling the execution of the remainder:' and we can scarcely doubt that literary ambition, no less than personal convenience, would lead him to prefer his present task, where he has events

against a single copy of the 'Times,' it may be well to remind him that Thucydides has left us but one work, of no extraordinary bulk, and generally regarded as a model of condensation.

of pith and moment to describe, and excellent authorities to rely on, to any successes which he may have achieved earlier in the day by scrutinizing the Messenian wars, or discussing the institutions of Solon. We do not mean to say that he has now developed any peculiar power which he had been previously prevented from displaying. Feeling as we do that no writer of our times can better afford to dispense with inappropriate compliments, we do not claim for him any marked narrative ability, or assert, in common critical parlance, that his style improves as he goes on. He recounts the issue of the battle of Arginusæ as he recounted the Hellenic legends, the difference being that the modern business-like language, half scientific, half colloquial, which serves to give a suitable notion of a great political crisis, is perceived to be out of place when applied to the fair humanities of classical mythology. The narrative itself is not that of an accomplished artist, but of a practical man. He speaks of the execution of the ten generals much as he might have spoken of it to the House of Commons, bringing out the facts in a straightforward way, and pointing his moral by weighty and impressive considerations, which a mere writer would probably have disposed of by some other means. It is this thoroughly practical character, indeed, which gives its charm to the whole book, considered as a literary work. The author is perceived to be full of his subject, and full too of all accessary knowledge which the history of other countries, and other times, as well as his own experience can supply. The mixture of disquisition with narrative, strictly so called, is a reflection of the process naturally going on in the mind of the reader, who feels that what is said appears as he himself might have said it, if he had enjoyed the requisite opportunities for such a labour. In this respect Mr. Grote is not unworthy of being compared with the original Thucydides, as the natural representative of the intelligence and education of his time, expressing his views in the readiest and most unaffected manner; though the contrast between the prolixity of the modern utilitarian, who 'has no time to make short cuts' to his object, and the compressedness of the ancient, 'always crowding upon himself,' is sufficiently curious, and we may add, not uninteresting. Even the mere style of the book, the wording and turn of the sentences, obvious as it is on the surface to the plainest critical objections, is seen in the long run to have a felicity which greater brilliancy and gracefulness of composition might have failed to realise. No attempt has been made to render it terser or purer than the tenour of ordinary conversation; and for that very reason it forms a transparent medium for transmitting the

desired character and colour at first hand, a mirror of the thoughtful wisdom and austere enthusiasm which inform and animate the writer. A picturesque style, as we had occasion to remind our readers in a former number, is apt to produce an untruthful effect, just as one of its principal ingredients, a well sustained metaphor, may deceive in proportion to the success with which it conveys a homogeneous impression *in aliâ materiâ*. On the same principle we cannot quarrel with Mr. Grote for giving a lower place to geographical illustration than is assigned to it by some recent writers, who maintain that historical events cannot be understood unless seen in relief against a background of natural scenery. The appreciation of history is, after all, a matter of faith rather than of sight, and a calm judgment will beware how it suffers sensation to encroach on the province of reflection. The temper of the English historian, we confess, is one with which the impulsive nature of a Greek would have had little sympathy, nor do we imagine that his work would have been adapted for recitation at the Olympic games. But the homage paid by the countryman of Bacon to the countrymen of Plato is not rendered less significant by the broad contrast of their respective national peculiarities; and the insight which can detect the fundamental identity of the two great methods of philosophical inquiry, may help us to discover a real harmony between the ardour which created the Athenian institutions, and the diligence and deliberation which delight in estimating their character and results.

It is no mere arbitrary connexion of thought which leads us to associate Mr. Grote's name with that of the great father of modern inductive philosophy. The conception of a scientific treatment of history is as yet so little understood, much less admitted, in England, that we almost seem to require an apology for venturing to characterise the present work as the first attempt which has been made within our knowledge, at least by an Englishman, to deal with history in the concrete as a portion of science. Mr. Grote, it is true, does not expressly speak of himself as desiring to regard his subject in this light; but it is sufficiently apparent that he recognises it both in theory and in practice. His general philosophy is evidently that of the positive school, as represented by M. Comte in France, and Mr. J. S. Mill among ourselves,—men, whose greatest triumph is that they have been able to imagine a science of society, and to indicate the conditions, whether practicable or not, under which its existence is conceivable. The chapter on Socrates, at the end of his last volume, places his sympathies beyond doubt: they were, however, abundantly clear at the very outset. In a

note to one of his earliest chapters, he mentions, as an unquestionable truth, M. Comte's cardinal 'doctrine of the three successive stages of the human mind in reference to scientific study, the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive.' This doctrine, it must be remembered, is insisted on by its promulgators, not as applicable merely to ordinary physics, but as the 'fundamental law of mental evolution;' and the *nisus*, which issued in its discovery, seems to have originated in the special necessity of providing a method for social science. Acknowledging it as an historical fact, and employing it as a solution of the development of the Greek mind, Mr. Grote is naturally led to adopt it as a law for his own guidance, and to see in positive inquiry the latest and most perfect birth of time. Few things are more remarkable in his book than the total absence of the theological spirit, which refers events to providential agency, instead of tracing them to what are ordinarily called second causes,—a fact which, whatever else it may prove, is at any rate significant as to the intellectual position he has taken up. Nor is he more solicitous to occupy a metaphysical ground, and explain history, *à priori*, by the supposed operation of essential powers, whether conceived of modestly as abstract principles, or realised with that startling distinctness of personification which a German admires in Hegel's prose, and an Englishman scarcely tolerates in Shelley's poetry. Every page bears the marks of a thoroughly positive habit of mind, exhibiting a Newtonian disdain of mere hypotheses, and seeking to astonish, not by ingenuity, but by completeness and universality of knowledge. His treatment of the legendary period of Greece, in his earlier volumes, which we have before had occasion to discuss on its own merits, is a specific instance of this peculiarity. It would of course be a misnomer to suppose that the positive method necessarily obliges an inquirer to forego the hope of extracting historical truth from fable, and to regard the legend simply as a legend. As a matter of fact, however, it has a tendency to do so by the attention which it enforces to the laws of physical investigation, and the rigour with which it excludes those considerations which generally tempt men to fill up blanks in history by the help of their own theories. That Mr. Grote's work contains nothing inconsistent with a positive view it would be in the last degree hazardous to affirm,—since a human science, like history, must always be expected to give far more scope for popular looseness of reasoning, and vicious metaphysical notions than natural philosophy can ever have done even in the days of the schoolmen: a point which will perhaps become clearer as we proceed. But it may be safely asserted

that English literature has, as yet, produced no instance in which the progression has been so distinctly made, and so consciously maintained.

Resting, as we do, the scientific pretensions of this history on its positive character, we must add a few words to prevent misconstruction. We are by no means prepared to join M. Comte and Mr. Mill in maintaining either the immediate possibility, or the absolute finality, of the positive method, still less to echo the less sober and guarded language indulged in by inferior writers of the same school. It is conceivable that history may, in the distant future, be found to be susceptible of those theological and metaphysical explanations which the world is at present unable to accept, even from a Vico or a Hegel; and in the mean time considerations drawn from divine Providence and the general fitness of things may afford food for something more than empty speculation to the individual reason and the individual conscience. Such truths, however, it is obvious, as at present apprehended, cannot be converted into a scientific basis for historical research; and the writer who employs them is in equal danger of discrediting his religious or philosophical belief, and of falsifying or neglecting the facts which it is his business to relate. The positive method, on the other hand, like its prototype, the Baconian induction, has the merit of attempting a work which, though destined, we fear, to remain long unaccomplished, does not lie so obviously out of the immediate reach of human faculties. Depending not on opinions but on facts, it will not suffer from the overthrow of systems built up on foundations independent of its own. The fruit may be more useful than shining, but the tree will never cumber the ground. The scientific worth of systematic discoveries made by an induction from the records of history, and tested by an appeal to the facts of the human mind, must remain firm in any case, whatever may be the formal or final causes to which the whole series of events owes its being; just as ordinary physical researches proceed undisturbed, while theologians and moralists are disputing about the conclusions which may legitimately be deduced from the aspect of the world of matter. There is no waste of labour, no possible squandering of ingenuity on questions which may turn out after all to have been wrongly raised or erroneously stated in the first instance. The course is one which, in Bacon's language, 'is not confined, like theories, to individuals,' but may be followed with equal success by persons differing most widely in their opinions on other subjects of inquiry and in their general mental constitution, so long as they honestly restrict their attention to the

problems which they have to solve, and do not introduce considerations for which a warrant has to be found elsewhere. Besides, the radical difference of object, which prevents it from making common cause with other kinds of inquiry, prevents it no less from being necessarily at war with them. It may have advantages which they have not; but these by no means secure it an exclusive right to attention. The question of right has to be tried in another court, in which it appears not as a judge but as a contending party. All that it can do of itself is to invite cultivation by the promise of more substantial proceeds than its rivals can at present hold out; and the force of its representations will depend on the minds which it addresses. Properly understood, it makes no claim to absolute intellectual dominion, but merely relies on those arguments which have in all ages been the strength of practical men against idealists. It is in this light, we venture to say, that Mr. Grote's work will be regarded by an unbiassed reader. The absence of expressions or statements indicative of theological belief, will be looked upon not as a declaration of hostilities, but as an omission which might have been dictated even to a divine by the Christian virtue of soberness of mind. Those who remark a deficiency in theory will set it down to the taste and temperament of the writer, rather than to his adoption of principles which forbid the use of hypotheses to the learned as well as to the unlearned. They will judge him as they judge other eminent authors, by what he has done, not by what he has failed to do; and recognising him as a disciple of the philosophy of fruit, will feel that no historian has better qualified himself for assisting at the Baconian vintage, the gleanings of the grapes of knowledge, which forms the reward of the careful and patient cultivator.

Leaving this high ground, on which we have scarcely been able to touch, we come to another aspect of Mr. Grote's history, which will probably be more interesting to the majority of our readers — the political. We scarcely know what M. Comte, who seems to regard modern liberal opinions as a vicious mass of metaphysical abstractions, will say to his disciple's applications of the *doctrine critique*. To us, however, they seem quite in keeping with the general tone of the work, be their bearing on its scientific pretensions what it may; and indeed eminently characteristic of the spirit in which a practical Englishman of the best sort will convert the past into a means of instruction for the present. Since Dr. Arnold's *History of Rome* no such attempt has been made to view the ancient world by the light of contemporary political experience; and Mr. Grote's teaching

is superior to Dr. Arnold's in proportion as it is more definite and systematic, as well as more business-like and practical. Our recollections of the Roman History of Dr. Arnold are too recent to suffer us to be unjust, even for a moment, to the union of calm wisdom with high enthusiasm which pervades the whole,—the result of the convictions, deep and serious, even if mistaken, of one who refused to understand politics in any other than their ancient Greek sense, and tolerated no lower standard in the State than that which he believed to be the apostolic law of the Church. But we need not look beyond the antecedents of the two men to see that Mr. Grote's qualifications in this particular are higher than any to which the historian of Rome could lay claim. If the one had 'the Bible, and Aristotle, and all history,' for the formation of his opinions, the other, already an Aristotelian and a historical student, if not a divine, enjoyed the invaluable privileges of a parliamentary career at a time when public events were more than usually stirring. Mr. Grote may have been too abstract for the House of Commons, even on a popular question like the Ballot; but the training which he there went through has been all-important as a means to a further end. The very faults of his audience must have enabled him to remedy many of his own original defects; though unfortunately he could not repay the obligation by communicating his peculiar excellences to his hearers and making them argue questions like men of science. Having been a philosopher among politicians, he is now able to take rank as a politician among philosophers. The senatorial arena has made him a hard and straightforward hitter in a field where flesh and blood pugilism is uncommon. The plain and homely directness of his style, to which we adverted above, comes out with sufficient prominence in his political expositions to show that he has lived with men who, surrounded as they are by conventional forms, generally contrive to let an opponent know unmistakeably what they think of him. The illustrations too which his multifarious knowledge has accumulated, both in text and notes, have something of a blue-book character about them, and remind us in matter, as well as in manner, of the documents and statistics which a speaker has to get up for a debate. Dr. Arnold's references, though varied and copious, are those of a man who has never had occasion to collect a political library; nor do we remember in his work any passage which can be compared for speciality of information with the monetary discussions in Mr. Grote's chapter on Solon, or the comparison, in the sixth volume, between the colonial governments of Athens and England. Nor is Mr. Grote's philosophical power less remarkable than his practical acquaint-

ance with detail. He has studied politics as a science, both in itself and in the subordinate sciences which minister to it, with a zeal which the occasions of political life may have stimulated, but which must have been owing in the first instance to innate aptitude and love for the subject. Technicality and precision are attributes which belong to him as a *doctrinaire* no less than as a man of business; contrasting strongly with that indefiniteness and uncertainty of tone which speculative deficiency and absorption in moral subjects tend almost unavoidably to produce in the political views even of the most liberal English theologian. Still, where we have two such eminent examples of success amid a crowd of failures, we will not be so impolitic or ungrateful as to separate them broadly from each other by an invidious comparison of their respective works, so long as it is open to us to class them together as having similar conceptions of the task before them, and see in the *History of Greece* an adequate realisation of the sketch drawn out in the Oxford Lectures on Modern History.

If a historian is to be a politician, it seems to follow almost as a matter of necessity, that he must be, to a certain extent at least, a party man. Dr. Arnold perceived this, if, indeed, he did not mean to anticipate opposition by selecting a crucial instance, when he spoke of Mitford as an author who has been preserved, in spite of his defects, by the salt of his political zeal. Certainly it is hard to conceive how a man can impart a contemporary interest to the politics of past times without a sympathy more or less pronounced with one or other of the parties of his day. Hegel, we believe, in discussing the very events with which Mr. Grote has last been occupied, contrived to hold the balance with judicial impartiality between Socrates and those who condemned him, representing the victim as necessarily sacrificed in the collision between the old and the new: but such lofty serenity of contemplation is not to be expected, perhaps not to be desired, from an Englishman and a non-transcendentalist. No one has left more earnest warnings against the dangers of party-spirit than Dr. Arnold; yet, in reducing his theory to practice, he naturally felt himself at liberty to take a side in each of the great questions that came before him, and in judging of others he plainly felt the necessity of sometimes tolerating the abuse for the sake of the use. In short, we know no case where literary ability and keenness of perception, unassisted by personal bias, have been sufficient for the production of a history, the political interest of which is real and permanent. It has been a common plan with critics to laud Thucydides for his impartiality; but, thanks to Mr. Grote, we

are now placed in a position to detect the party prejudice which lurks behind his dignified reticence, not less real, while far more effective, than the outspoken and demonstrative animosity shown by later advocates of the same cause. This necessity, of course, does not discharge a historian from the duty of giving, to the best of his power, a candid view of the motives and conduct of opponents, any more than it would justify him as a citizen, in forming his opinions unconscientiously and supporting them unscrupulously. But the consideration of it may well teach us moderation both in our estimate of the work of an antagonist, and in our hopes from the labours of those who are engaged on our own side of the question. Mr. Henry Drummond told the House of Commons, *à propos* of the educational changes in Oxford and Cambridge, that modern history had fallen into the hands of Whig pamphleteers; being, apparently, ignorant not only of the value of the admission he was making against his friends, but of the plain truth, that the more intelligent the holders of any set of opinions, the more extensively they are likely to apply them, in the explanation of other times, as well as of their own. Great would be our error if we were to assume, that the eminent Liberal writers who, as he truly says, have, of late years, been almost the only modern historians, are so thoroughly masters of the field, that no one of opposite sentiments can hope to approach it with any chance of success. We should be the last willingly to undervalue the possible results of profound and accurate research: but it would be unwise to forget that, so far as the political truth of history is concerned, they are likely to affect details rather than principles. The faithlessness of Charles I. has been established by a weight of evidence so overwhelming, as to make the summary verdict of acquittal pronounced by Hume look very like dishonesty: yet the question of his execution is still open. If, in the present day, with the means of information on passing events sufficiently accessible to every body, we find one large section of men approving of the conduct of a ministry, and another censuring it, how can we expect that any history, to be written three hundred years hence, will so treat the questions which are now vexing us, as to leave no room for difference of sentiment among its readers? Time, which softens the mere asperities of personal and party feeling, and tests measures and courses of policy by their ultimate issue, is, as yet, powerless against such influences as those which, whatever form they may assume, have in all ages alike asserted themselves as the opposing forces of political action. What the world, then, has a right to demand of a historian, so long as party differences exist, is not that he

, should tell his story without bias, but that he should write like a man conscious of his liability to be swayed in this or that direction, — so that they may be better able to eliminate, each in his own way, the disturbing element, and distinguish the terms which require to be translated into another language from those which are to remain constant. The conclusion may appear a humiliating one, to persons who desire the credit of teaching, or the satisfaction of learning, absolute truth in matters political : but so it is. Others, we trust, there are, who will see in it a mere application of the liberal maxim which, by disallowing the exclusive pretensions of any one instructor, secures a sectional jurisdiction to each. M. Comte may condemn our doctrine as anarchical : but Mr. Grote is not sufficiently in advance of the philosophy of toleration to be entitled to complain, if we treat him as he has endeavoured to treat the States and Statesmen of Greece.

As we have already intimated, it is during the administration of Pericles, and the Peloponnesian War, that Grecian history first begins to acquire the peculiar interest of modern party struggles. Accordingly it is in the volumes before us, taken in connexion with their immediate predecessor, on which we were scarcely able to bestow even the most passing glance in our former notice, that Mr. Grote's qualifications as a political or party historian are most prominently displayed. The admirable chapter on the Greek despots at the opening of the third volume, and the view of the revolution under Clisthenes in the fourth, showed us what we had to expect when the nature of the subject should call out his personal feelings, and the existence of contemporary records enable him to pass from dissertation into narrative ; and similar praise is due to the account of Pericles and his changes, with which the fifth volume concludes. But it is one thing to discuss the Athenian constitution, and another to exhibit it in its actual working : one thing to remark casually on the analogy between the demagogue and the opposition speaker, and another to show how the character and conduct of the popular leader at Athens may be vindicated, if regarded in the light of this suggestion. The 'rehabilitation of Cleon' was a work which Mr. Grote might have been expected to undertake, both from his general predilections and from the implied promise just alluded to. Yet, after studying it, it is impossible not to feel that the merit consists, not so much in a fortunate *aperçu*, as in the ability with which evidence is sifted, and facts arrayed in support of a foregone conclusion. In any case, the undoubted novelty of the position seems to call for an examination at length ; and we gladly embrace the opportunity of

applying the considerations contained in our former paragraph, partly against Mr. Grote, partly against some of those who have questioned his mode of proceeding, and also disputed his conclusions.

Hitherto the very notion of setting up a defence for Cleon, has presented itself to most minds only as a ridiculous absurdity. With Thucydides against him, and no ancient author on his side, the weight of testimony appeared overwhelming. The representation of Aristophanes, under any circumstances, would have had all the plausibility of a thoroughly well-told tale: Regarded as a confirmation of facts already attested, it was at once felt to be irresistible, imparting to the facts themselves, that ideal life-like colouring, which, even in the judgment of philosophers, makes poetry so much truer than history. Besides, there was something probable and consistent in the picture itself; the portrait of a vulgar blustering politician, half coward, half bully, availing himself of his powers of face and tongue and the natural sympathy of the baser sort to run down good men and good manners. Such a person was thought likely enough to have existed at any period of partisan warfare; and as the violent career and rapid decline of the Athenian democracy was commonly supposed to furnish a strong argument against republican institutions, there was a consilience of probabilities in favour of the assertion that he had actually existed at Athens. Even those who were most anxious to defend Athens against the wholesale and unscrupulous attacks of the anti-democratic party, felt that they must give up certain parts of her policy, discredited as it had been by ill success: and no set of men appeared more proper, on historical as well as on general grounds, to be selected for sacrifice, than Cleon and the class to which he belonged. Thus, in England, it is not merely such writers as Mitford and Mr. Mitchell who have prejudiced the minds of the generality of readers against the Athenian demagogue: Dr. Arnold leaves him where he found him, while Bishop Thirlwall, after describing him originally as an unredeemed reprobate, exerts himself in his second edition, in tone of moral, almost of episcopal reprobation, to drown the solitary voice which has been raised in arrest of judgment among the more critical scholars of Germany. Yet there were considerations on the other side which might have led liberal thinkers, such as those whom we have last named, to pause before making an absolute and unconditional surrender. The surrender was one demanded by the opponents of democracy, on the authority of a man who, though immeasurably superior to party in its lowest sense, was so far partial, as every one who feels strongly about the

events of his time must necessarily be, whatever his nobleness of mind or depth of thought. Aristophanes, if good for anything, was as good against Socrates as against Cleon; being in fact, from his intellectual and social position, as fair a judge of both, as Theodore Hook of the policy of the Whigs and the theology of Dr. Arnold. No word has been transmitted to us by Cleon's friends, to show how he really appeared to the party which he is admitted to have led; and the same causes which prevented the multiplication of contemporary documents in ancient times, tended to impair the trustworthiness of the verdict of posterity; till at last, when we come down to Plutarch, the few additional facts which we gain are almost utterly valueless, unless we are ourselves prepared to go through the process of historical criticism in all its stages. At any rate the general value of the case made out, might have been more considerably appreciated by men who had modern lights to guide them. Cleon was said to have been a violent and unprincipled declaimer; and they knew what was meant by violent and unprincipled declamation in their own day. He had raised himself to political importance by his wealth; and they knew what were the good and bad sides of a commercial aristocracy. He was vulgar and boisterous in his manner; and they knew what deficiencies were to be expected from a man of his class, and how far the opposite party was likely to overrate them. The very use which was made of his name, as a synonyme for modern demagogism, might of itself have taught them better. When they heard O'Connell spoken of as the modern Cleon, they might have recollected that the 'big beggarman' was not the only name by which the political world recognised the great agitator.

We see, then, that Mr. Grote, in asking us to reconsider our judgment of Cleon, has an antecedent probability in his favour, no less imposing than that which has been commonly believed to be all-powerful in the other direction. Nor does his case appear to break down when he comes to grapple more closely with the facts. He proceeds to impugn the evidence of Thucydides on the further ground, that the historian was prejudiced against the demagogue who had been the author of his banishment; a fact which would naturally account for the contemptuous tone invariably adopted throughout the history in speaking of Cleon. This argument has been said — very unreasonably, we think — to run in a circle, as if two probabilities could not be used to strengthen each other. To us it appears a perfectly legitimate employment of historical hypothesis, whatever may be thought of its absolute conclusiveness. Marcellinus, from whose life of Thucydides the statement is taken, may not be a very high authority; but his assertion is remarkably explicit, is not

improbable in itself, and is contradicted, so far as we are aware, by no external testimony whatever. Neither are we inclined to blame Mr. Grote for seeing no adverse significance in the first recorded passage of Cleon's career — his opposition to Pericles. Even in the present day an ultra-popular speaker may combine on occasion with the aristocratic party against a popular leader without being singled out for special and unqualified condemnation; much more in ancient times, when party policy was less systematised, and party morality, in consequence, less stringent. Mr. Grote, in drawing attention to the substantial identity between ancient and modern politics, could not have expected that his point would be taken so literally and pressed so relentlessly against himself. Besides, we may well imagine that the removal of the overwhelming individuality of the 'warrior statesman' must have greatly affected the relative positions of those whom he left behind him, especially in the case of a man like Cleon, entering upon public life young, and naturally determined in his course by his social condition and his popular talents. The political tactics of a hearing must always differ in many things from those of a reading age: and in a democracy like that of Athens, of which the very essence was free discussion, a genuine democrat doubtless felt that he was fulfilling his true mission in criticising every measure which might be brought forward, and endeavouring to weaken the influence of any one who had the power of commanding the assembly. Cleon's conduct in the matter of the Mitylencans Mr. Grote does not attempt to justify; at the same time that he palliates it by a reference to the inhuman sentiments of the age; and, following a hint of Archbishop Whately, reminds us opportunely that appeals in favour of justice against expediency have been made to popular audiences by politicians of a very different stamp. The vote which redeemed the character of the Athenians may be doubtless said to have condemned the man who opposed it; but the condemnation is one which he shares with a large portion of his countrymen, as the numbers are expressly said to have been nearly equally divided. Mr. Grote's remarks, we think, were absolutely required by justice to abate the force of the verdict which would instantly be pronounced by the conscience of a modern reader. Surely it cannot be unimportant to recollect that, where our judgment after all is compelled to be unfavourable, there may be circumstances which make the conduct censured as much an error as a crime. Meantime we may observe that the speech in which Cleon is recorded to have reiterated his sanguinary proposition is neither that of a monster nor of a charlatan, but one containing no mean amount of political wisdom strikingly expressed,

and altogether well adapted to weigh with a cultivated audience; so that we must either suppose Thucydides to have violated historical and dramatic propriety, or must be prepared to modify the view with which Dr. Thirlwall has so resolutely identified himself. Cleon's treatment of the Lacedæmonian ambassadors Mr. Grote willingly gives up: feeling as we do that in a commonwealth, where publicity is the order of the day, grave abuses of the privilege may occur without reflecting any peculiar discredit on the politician who commits them. We wish he had shown the like forbearance in speaking of the subsequent proceedings about Pylos, where it would have been equally possible to set up a defence, without injuring his cause by over-statement. If the account of Thucydides is to be taken as in every way corresponding to the facts, it can hardly be doubted that it was something more than personal merit or prudent foresight which enabled Cleon to fulfil the charge thrust upon him. The undertaking may have been a feasible one, but he was not the man in whose hands it could be expected to prosper. His true sphere, as Mr. Grote has elsewhere pointed out, was not the field, but the assembly, though he may not always have been able to decline those sterner duties which public opinion at Athens seems to have exacted from every *bonâ fide* aspirant after political fame. We need not blame him for seeking to decline the offer which his unguarded language provoked, any more than we need seriously condemn his opponents for availing themselves of the advantage which he afforded to them: but we cannot but feel that after this it can have been no disparagement to him to dwell chiefly on the good fortune which, by blessing him with a distinguished colleague and other favourable contingencies, enabled him to get through the affair creditably, instead of failing through his personal incompetency, as was apparently the case at Amphipolis. Thucydides, as usual, looks at the proceeding from his own point of view; and writers like Mitford, who have followed him, have been inconsistent with themselves and with probability, in their eagerness to blacken the character which they hated. The aspect on which Aristophanes has fixed is not incompatible with that taken by Thucydides, who, as Mr. Grote should have remembered, is equally one of 'the laughs after the fact;' but it is, at any rate, quite independent of and unconnected with it; so that the counsel for the defence may fairly argue that whatever may be the force of the two charges, neither the one nor the other is such as would *necessarily* occur even to a prejudiced witness. Still, though we need not believe that the Athenians pressed on the matter, merely as a joke, to damage a man whose influence with them is just before said to

have been unrivalled, we can hardly doubt that his friends must have thought it a hazardous experiment, or that the cheers with which Mr. Grote takes pleasure in imagining him to have been overwhelmed on his return, were given in honour of an escape rather than of a success. It would be too much, however, to suppose, with ordinary historians, that his good fortune can have had any weight in confirming him in his war policy. Doubtless he must personally have been greatly elated by the result of his expedition in proportion to the hesitation with which he undertook it: nor is it any scandal to conceive that a man of his temper would naturally, in his subsequent appeals to the people, make use of the political capital which he had so unexpectedly realised. But it is not likely that he rushed of his own accord into a second expedition, in the hope of doubling the credit acquired by the first; though, finding it forced on him by circumstances, he may have consoled himself with a belief that his good genius would not desert him. Proud as he might have been of his laurels, he cannot have been unwilling to repose on them, as he seems actually to have done during the year which followed Sphacteria; content to have it fancied that he could take a command if he chose, while he really went on strengthening his influence by other means. Mr. Grote, we think, has again been a little unreasonable in contending that, as a man of peace, he can have had no personal wish for the continuance of the war. Thucydides is, of course, no authority on the question of an opponent's motives; and when he speaks of the war as giving occasion for unscrupulous calumnies, we feel at once that he is thinking of his own case. Again, we would not underrate the force with which Mr. Grote shows, from Grecian history, that, in some points of view, a peace policy was more suitable to a demagogue's purposes. Still the fact remains, that the democratic party were as anxious for war as their opponents for peace, and we naturally presume that the principles of each were, in some measure, dictated by their interests. The truth clearly is, that the cause of progress at Athens had come to be identified with the continuance of a war which had been provoked by the measures of her most liberal statesman, at once imperialising abroad and democratic at home; while the friends of oligarchy were not merely by implication, but actually and consciously, the friends of Sparta, inheriting those notions about the domestic advantages of a balance of power which gave point to Cimon's Pan-Hellenic patriotism. It is possible that the same instinct which led Cleon to desire a Peloponnesian war, might have made him, under other, perhaps under ordinary circumstances, equally interested in preserving peace. As it is, we

have only to remark, that the subsequent history of the war quite bears out what we have just said of the feelings of the respective parties. With regard to Cleon's own conduct at Amphipolis, Mr. Grote merely puts in a plea of guilty, hoping that his client may be recommended to mercy, on the ground of having done no more than other incompetent men would have done in the face of a disaffected soldiery and a powerful enemy. No other alternative seems to be left to those who accept the narrative of Thucydides: and, after all, it may be said, that the verdict will bear lightly on one who had to be judged, not by his military, but by his political merits. It may be worth while, however, to observe, especially as the point has escaped the notice of Mr. Grote, that gross cowardice and inaptitude for command are not included among the catalogue of misdeeds which Aristophanes imputes to Cleon. As in the *Knights* we hear much of Cleon's knavery in the matter of Pylos, but nothing of his ludicrous inefficiency; so in the *Peace* his death is mentioned along with that of Brasidas solely to show that the two great promoting causes of the war had been removed, without a word about his misconduct in the action. The poet had no occasion to panegyrisé the Spartan general: but it is difficult to understand how it is that throughout his works he contrives to miss the opportunity of fixing on his old enemy a fresh stigma, of which he already knew the capabilities, having applied it successfully to others. Though he affects to spare the dead man, he does not dismiss him without a few contemptuous lines; and one of these would have been sufficient to associate for ever the names of Cleon and Cleonymus. We do not see how to account for this forbearance, except by supposing that Cleon's deficiency was less palpable to the majority of his countrymen than to the experienced judgment of Thucydides. It would seem that they regarded him, even in their bitterest moments, simply as a popular leader, attributing to him all the sins, actual and possible, of his class, and tacitly acquitting him of any further charges, either as unproved or as really irrelevant.

Such is our summary of the leading points of Mr. Grote's plea, amended as we should wish to see them amended. It would not be uninteresting to compare them in detail with the previous vindication of Cleon by Droysen, the German translator of Aristophanes, whose perverseness in defending the indefensible so much scandalises the intellectual and moral sense of Dr. Thirlwall. In one respect Droysen's opinion is the more valuable of the two, as it is no predilection for Athens, but rather a strong repugnance to her, which induces him to take up the cause of Cleon, whom he praises for having faithfully developed the

tendencies of his nation. On the whole, however, our countryman might safely sustain a comparison between his cautious experimental mode of procedure and the more dashing tactics of the Continental scholar, who dwells, among other things, on the essentially aggressive nature of a democracy, 'ever feeding 'onward like a flame.' But we have lingered long enough among mere particulars. We have followed Mr. Grote carefully throughout the construction of his argument; and the corrections and modifications which we have ventured to interpose must already have shown that we are not unwilling to adopt it, though only to a certain extent, as our own. Still, while believing the hypothesis to be on the whole a legitimate one, and desiring ourselves to remove some of the objections which seem to us to lie against it, as originally stated, we cannot conceal from ourselves that after all it has but a hypothetical value. It has established for itself a right to rank along with the common and conflicting view, but not to supersede it. It has shown, not that the facts must be understood in a different way from that hitherto recognised, but simply that they may. In some measure this uncertainty is owing to the state of the facts themselves. For the greater part of them we have only the authority of a few chapters in Thucydides, the statements in which have to be checked by the consideration of certain supposed prejudices on the part of the writer. We feel that there are numbers of points on which we ought to require more information if there were any prospect of obtaining it. The question of Thucydides' own banishment, discussed by Mr. Grote, is a case in point. The dispute is not a very important one, and we have no desire to go into the arguments on both sides; for our general impression is, that the evidence is insufficient to warrant any conclusion at all. Mr. Grote presumes that the historian had no reason for remaining at Thasos; other writers presume that he had; our knowledge being wholly confined to the fact that he did remain there, and not even extending to the question whether his conduct in so doing was the gravamen of the charge brought against him. But the uncertainty of the facts is by no means the most serious impediment in the way of a positive result. Were this all, whatever might be said of the absolute value of Mr. Grote's conclusions, we should not have to speak of them as equally doubtful with those of his predecessors; since the balance would always incline towards the possessor of the soundest judgment and the ripest knowledge. In the present case, however, the uncertainty lies much deeper, if, indeed, it does not underlie the whole.

The presumption which, as we have seen, entitles Mr.

Grote to be heard on Cleon's behalf, proceeded on the supposition, that where political matters are concerned the same history will be differently written and differently read by different persons. Roman Catholics could not be expected to be content till they had a historian of their own in Dr. Lingard. When the dog bit the Bishop of London, Sidney Smith pleasantly observed, that he should like to hear the dog's story. It is by perceiving the similarity of Cleon's position to that of others, of whom we know two opinions to have been entertained, that we come to admit the possibility of reversing a decision which at first sight appears to be as unequivocal as it is unanimous. But for our experience of the power of party-spirit to disturb the judgment, we should have no reason to question the joint evidence of Aristophanes and Thucydides. To balance their supposed bias, we feel it to be of importance that the facts should be reviewed by an historian of opposite leanings; and thus Mr. Grote's judgment derives a value, not only from his great knowledge, but also from his prejudices. But though this method of difference is avowedly introduced as a corrective, yet it is not calculated to produce absolute correctness, even in the decision of a critic, who is bound to decide after hearing both sides. Some few points the very completeness of the investigation will generally be found to clear up, so as to afford no reasonable grounds for question on the part of any of the litigants. But, as a general rule, it is not the agreement of the two parties which is to be looked for as the practical result, but their better mutual understanding. We are not aware that a single passage in Cleon's life can be said to be removed from the danger of misconstruction, even by a fair-minded opponent. To those who think ill of the Athenian populace, and consider the title of demagogue a condemnation in itself, the old account will remain as credible as ever; nor will it be easy to shake this belief so long as liberal thinkers themselves are compelled to admit that a worthless popular leader is not abstractedly an impossibility. What Mr. Grote in our judgment has accomplished is, to show that there is nothing so special in Cleon's case as excepts him from the number of those who, being political characters, must be judged by their principles as well as by their actions. Nor should it be supposed that we think this a slight thing to have done. The mere *aperçu* might have occurred to many, as it probably has occurred to some, only to be discarded; but every one could not have justified it by a successful development in detail. Droysen's endeavour, though unquestionably meritorious, is carried out with too little precision and definiteness

of aim, and, in a word, with too much crotchettiness, to produce any very decided conviction. Previously to the appearance of Mr. Grote's sixth volume, the work was yet to do. Whatever reception his arguments may meet from those of his own persuasion who have already formed their judgment of this period of history under different lights, we venture to believe that their weight will certainly be acknowledged by subsequent students of the same school. Minds which might otherwise have been led by their better feelings, as well as by traditional sentiment, to regard the actual authority of a justly celebrated historian more than the possible claims of an undefended demagogue, will be reassured when they see that a writer, competent to speak, if ever a man were rendered so by profound and patient research, and avowing himself 'among the first and warmest' of the admirers of Thucydides, asserts confidently that Cleon has been misrepresented. It is no light thing either for the most ordinary reader of history to know, that a personage who has hitherto been thought worthy of unmixed reprobation and contempt is capable of being viewed in another light, even though curiosity should be too sluggish to be stimulated by the information. Nor can it be of no moment that those who approach history as a science should be reminded that many of its problems depend for their solution on other than purely historical considerations, and, consequently, that they must not expect perfect satisfaction until the heterogeneous element is eliminated or absorbed.*

* Since writing the above, we have seen a pamphlet by Mr. Shilleto, of Cambridge celebrity, entitled 'Thucydides or Grote?' the first part of which is devoted to a discussion of the Cleon question. We do not, however, find that he says any thing which materially affects our previous conclusions. His exposure of the inconsistency of Marcellinus merely proves that biographer to have been an uncritical compiler, whose trustworthiness is, if anything, rather exalted by any imputation on his judgment, as he must obviously have had some external ground to go upon. We may admit the dramatic coherency of Thucydides' narrative, just as we do those literary excellences on which Mr. Shilleto dwells with so much philological fondness, yet refuse to accept it as any thing more than the individual impression of a prejudiced though honourable man. As against Mr. Grote, the pamphlet is successful in showing that Cleon can yet be attacked; but it does not show that he cannot be defended. Nor does the examination of Thucydides' conduct at Amphipolis add any thing more positive to the stock of more or less definite possibilities already existing. Of the latter part of the pamphlet, foreign as it is to our present purpose, we will only say that as the meaning of Thucydides in various passages happens to be the very question at issue,

The same remarks will apply to the other great instance in which Mr. Grote has sought his clients among parties already condemned,—we mean the Sophists. There is some superficial difference between the cases, as in the latter he appears almost entirely unconscious of any bias, defending the prisoners on the ground of simple justice, not on the merits of their opinions; and, in fact, denying that they can be said, as a class, to have had any distinguishing opinions at all, so that their condemnation has been not so much an act of party tyranny as a pure mistake. We suspect, however, that the original presumption which gives plausibility to his defence here, as before, arises out of the belief that the question is essentially one of party. We find the sophists uniformly decried on the same grounds which are taken against the holders of particular opinions in the present day; we find, also, that modern writers have perceived this analogy, and have used it freely as a weapon against their opponents; and we conclude, not that the application springs from a misconception, wilful or otherwise, but that there is a double-edged justice in it, and that as the sophists of the nineteenth century are not to be judged from hostile representations, some excuse may possibly be to be made for their prototypes. By proving the sophists to have been really professional teachers for practical life, Mr. Grote has not precluded all controversy as to the quality of their influence. Mr. Maurice, in the new edition of his ‘*Essay on Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*,’ has already shown that they may be condemned just as easily on the new pleadings as on the old, turning the very fact of their practical professions into a charge against them, and inferring from their specific differences the wide-spread nature of the evil which he supposes them to have fostered. If they were the teachers of their age, and not its reformers, the opinions entertained respecting them must depend on the manner in which the age is estimated, as well in its tendencies as in its characteristics. The question which Mr. Disraeli puts in *Tancred*, ‘Progress from ‘what and to what?’ will naturally occur in speaking of men admitted to have been the legists if not the legislators of a state of society which had its beginning and its end. Our plan does not lead us to discuss this question, but only to call

‘Shilleto or Grote?’ would have been a more appropriate, though possibly less imposing, title. Colonel Mure also has been entering into controversy with Mr. Grote upon some minor matters: we wish, for the sake of good scholarship and good manners, that Mr. Shilleto had conducted his argument with the same grave respect for himself and his opponent. It would not have been required of him to pay a single compliment or abjure a single prejudice.

attention to its existence. We should, however, not be doing justice to Mr. Grote, if we rested satisfied with remarking on the limits which it imposes upon him, without at the same time endeavouring to ascertain how much he has been able to effect in spite of them. As we have said more than once, the only way to appreciate his merits is to follow him in detail, however much such a course may multiply the occasions on which we find ourselves at issue with him.

No one can read Mr. Grote's sixty-seventh chapter without feeling that the subject has gained much from being discussed by a man of his mental habits and prepossessions. In England, it has been the custom to regard it from a moral or politico-theological,—in Germany, from a metaphysical,—point of view. Even Dr. Thirlwall has contented himself with a somewhat vague echo of the common language, apparently considering that there was no occasion to take a fresh survey of the facts. The opportunity of a really historical investigation had been left to Mr. Grote, and he has taken it. If, as we have surmised, his doctrinal sympathies gave an impulse to the inquiry, at any rate it cannot be said that he has conducted it in the mere spirit of partizanship. Strong in the positive tendency, he grapples with the ancient authorities, and endeavours to educe the desired conclusion from a separate examination of each. Such a process, whether successful or not, can hardly fail to produce a material change in the aspect of the case. It is something to find it established by undoubted evidence, that the name Sophist represented, primarily at least, a class of men, not a school; embracing Socrates and Plato no less than Gorgias and Protagoras. We gain a different notion of the modes and conditions of their influence, whatever we may believe the worth of that influence to have been. We see that to the eye of Aristophanes the dialectician and the rhetorician appeared to be doing precisely the same work: and this *primâ facie* identity comes in to modify our estimate of the relation between the two. Besides, after all, the reader may urge that his concern is with the sophists proper, those attacked as such by Plato, whose charges are sufficiently definite to justify a common trial, if not a common condemnation. Accepting the issue tendered, the positive inquirer has much to say. He shows that the quarrel of the Platonic Socrates with the sophists was that of a reasoner with declaimers, of a gratuitous talker with paid teachers, of a theorist with practical men, of an irreconcilable foe to his age with men imbued with its spirit — considerations of undeniable importance in measuring the strength of his language, and determining the extent to which it can fairly be

adopted by a modern student of history. Still, this does not meet the difficulties of those who feel that the primary objects of Socrates and his disciple were moral, and who, consequently, look with more than suspicion on the system which they opposed. Accordingly the question is raised, what was the ethical character of the sophistic teaching? Here Mr. Grote exerts himself with considerable effect, to show that the opinion entertained of his clients in modern times is inconsistent with what we know of them, from themselves, and from their contemporaries. Prodicus's Choice of Hercules is, as he justly remarks, an unimpeachable witness in favour of its author, — reckoned in its day an excellent piece of morality even by Socrates himself, and consecrated in our own by its admission into the classic pages of Enfield's speaker, and associated, therefore, with some of the earliest virtuous impressions which our young Englishmen receive. It is, surely, a little ungenerous, as well as unhistorical, in Mr. Maurice, to insinuate a doubt of the motives which dictated this highly laudable composition; as if Prodicus wished to persuade the Athenian youth to self-denial, in the hope of becoming powerful men, and thus, ultimately, moral pests to society. The Grecian lecturer may have dwelt on the importance of virtue to the State, and even recommended an honourable ambition without rendering himself fairly obnoxious to any such imputations. And if the reproach be transferred from him to his hearers, it is no more than lies at the door of numbers of educated people in our own day, who value knowledge merely as a means to worldly ends. Again Protagoras, even as represented by Plato, appears to have differed from Socrates rather in the method than in the results of his moral teaching, while in his conception of the relative character of virtue he may be considered superior to his questioner. Our judgment on his theological scepticism must depend on the amount of evidence which we conceive to have existed in those times for a reasonable mind,—a historical question which will be ruled in one way by men like Mr. Grote, and in another by those who claim Aristophanes and Plato as joint witnesses for Anglican orthodoxy. His doctrine of 'Man the measure of all things,' and the denial by Gorgias of ontology, are to be estimated, we need hardly say, by their value as philosophical positions; and this with especial reference to their place in the history of human speculation, not by their supposed agreement or disagreement with the Thirty-nine Articles. The Gorgias of Plato, taken as it stands, would go far to fix on those whom it attacks the charge of being the corruptors of youth; but it must be

recollected on the other side that Gorgias is known expressly to have disavowed the picture of himself;—that the effect of the exhibition of Polus is in a great measure neutralised, as Mr. Grote remarks, by the willingness of Socrates to give him the benefit of such respectable supporters as Nicias and Pericles;—and, lastly, that Callicles, the most flagrant of the supposed offenders, is not a sophist, but, on the contrary, a despiser of the whole order, which he regards much as Mandeville did the clergy. Between his doctrine, indeed, and that of Thrasymachus there appears to have been no substantial difference,—for the question is really not about any supposed rule of natural right, but about justice as ordinarily understood, which they concur in pronouncing a contemptible expedient, though taking different views of the political necessity from which it sprang. And, the only inference which we need draw is, that the profession, like other learned professions, was not altogether free from unworthy brethren, especially in the rhetorical branch of it. It was not necessary to Mr. Grote's defence of his clients that he should maintain the innocence of each individual, in defiance of the probability, that oral teaching, especially when directed to practical life, will be found equally susceptible of abuse and of use. Voltaire, we suspect, had something more than a speculative interest in maintaining a proposition from which it could be deduced, that a teacher who escaped pelting could not be immoral; at any rate, his censors might fairly have asked him whether his own popularity was not a fact on the opposite side. On the other hand, we can scarcely be wrong in making much of Plato's admission, that the Athenians themselves, and not the sophists, were the true corruptors of youth. Though it may seem only to shift the blame, it, in effect, modifies our views of the real nature of the complaint. Where the evil is so wide-spreading and so deeply seated, we look with increased tolerance on the alleged deficiencies of physicians. And we may feel that we have the sanction of the great philosopher himself in his calmer moments, in believing him to have differed from his opponents not so much in his general purpose as a moral teacher, as with regard to the depth at which he thought it necessary to begin the work of national regeneration. None but a very bitter dissenter would charge the Establishment of his day with destroying more souls than it saves.

It is precisely in characterising an argument like this, that the commonplaces of criticism are most at fault. Mr. Grote's merit is not that he has set the question at rest, but that he has prevented it, so far as we see, from ever resting again. His learning and discernment have again enabled him to enlarge the

debateable ground of Grecian history,—not so much by subtracting anything from the ordinarily received facts, as by adding to them. As in the case of Cleon, we can have no difficulty in prophesying that the sophists will henceforth find their chances of a favourable judgment indefinitely mended, though there should be no reversal. If Mr. Grote has done nothing else, he has at least pointed out the quarters in which they may most naturally look for friends and foes respectively. They will continue to encounter the hostility of those who think with Aristophanes, that the most ignorant times are necessarily the most virtuous. But wherever there is a genuine feeling of admiration for Athenian greatness—such a feeling as Niebuhr did not hesitate to express, even at the expense of Plato—they are likely to be mentioned with respect—perhaps with sympathy. And when modern Platonism has left off discovering the Church in the Republic, and the ‘principle of infant baptism’ in the Laws, it may possibly be brought to admit that Plato’s attitude towards his rivals can hardly be sustained by men who are not prepared, like Plato, to claim for philosophers the government as well as the teaching of their generation.

In closing our remarks on this, the most important portion of a great national work, we are afraid to think of the quantity of matter which we have left untouched. It may seem strange that we should have spoken of Cleon and the sophists, without having had a word to say about Pericles or Socrates. But we have come rather late into the field, and it is no wonder that we should find the choicest part of it reaped already. We trust, however, that our gleanings have enabled us to present a tolerably fair sample of what we consider Mr. Grote’s characteristic merits, insufficient as it may be to give any notion of his results. The true moral to be derived from his labours is, as it seems to us, not so much what a man of genius can do with a great subject, as what can be done in any department of history by a writer having the heart to embrace, and the resolution to avail himself of the vast appliances which modern times place at his disposal. The inductive method may not tend ‘to level wit and intellect’ so absolutely as Bacon imagined; but it leads us to fix our attention on the qualities which are necessary to a sustained effort, rather than on those which are called into action by an occasional inspiration.

. . .

ART. IX. — *William Penn: an Historical Biography.* By WILLIAM HEPWORTH DIXON, author of 'Life of Howard.' London: 1851.

'WILLIAM PENN,' says Mr. Dixon, in his Preface, 'has been called a mythical rather than an historical personage. The accounts given of him by his professed biographers, Besse, Clarkson, Weems, and Lewis, are sufficiently vague, lifeless, and transcendental, to merit such a censure. . . . All these are Quaker lives. No writer has yet treated of Penn as a great English historical character, — the champion of the Jury Laws, — the joint leader with Algernon Sidney of the Commonwealth men, — the royal councillor of 1684–8, — the courageous defender of free thought, — the founder of Pennsylvania! This omission I have now endeavoured to supply: with what success the reader must decide. . . . I have endeavoured to make him live again: his throes and his struggles, his ideas and his actions, his gait and his person, his business and his amusements; the habits of his domestic life, the furniture of his house, the setting out of his table, everything that makes the individuality of character, even down to the contents of his cellar, the inventory of his coach house, and the completeness of his stables, I have tried to bring before the reader with the same vividness with which they present themselves to my own mind. In this endeavour I can, even at best, have but partially succeeded; yet I hope sufficiently to have changed him from a myth into a man.'

We have extracted these words from Mr. Dixon's preface, not only to show the task he proposed himself, but why, in our opinion, he has unavoidably failed in executing it. His objects are not to draw a simple likeness of the Quaker hero, but to erect a statue to him, labelling the pedestal, after the fashion of such monuments, with a number of idle if not contradictory epithets. For any writer who attempts to exaggerate William Penn into a great historical character, a leader of the Commonwealth men, and a royal councillor, must needs reverse Mr. Dixon's laudable object, and convert a known and familiar personage into a very Oriental myth indeed.

In plain truth, the most ingenious biographer, and Mr. Dixon is not wanting in such ingenuity, cannot make much novelty out of William Penn as a character, whatever he may do in the way of adding particulars to his history. It is not a character susceptible of refined analysis, or leaving much scope

for curious conjecture. Its traits are few and simple; and they stand in no need of a delineator. What his Quaker biographers, treating him, as Mr. Dixon says, in mythical fashion, have omitted to do for him, he has amply done for himself. No man more habitually wore his heart upon his sleeve, or walked more openly among mankind, not only with little to conceal, but with a strong natural communicativeness of disposition. A very cursory perusal of his works, and the notices of him by contemporaries who personally knew him, will admit the reader into greater intimacy with the 'man Penn,' than the most elaborate biography carefully got up for the modern market. We do not here speak of Penn's conduct in the singular positions in which the course of events placed him; that is by no means all of it equally clear, nor was he doubtless equally frank in his avowals of it,—we speak only of that ingenuousness and openness regarding feelings and impressions which characterised him, as it does all men of his peculiar disposition. Therefore, though there may be much to add to our knowledge concerning Penn's household affairs, and the contents of his stable and cellar,—and here we are bound to admit that Mr. Dixon has imparted some discoveries,—though there is a great deal which requires and deserves investigation as to his political proceedings, and here Mr. Dixon has to our mind rather increased than dispelled the obscurity,—yet, as to the character of the individual, if our author has not added much to our knowledge, the fault lay perhaps rather in the subject, which scarcely admits of such addition, than in himself.

Mr. Dixon very rightly introduces his subject by a sketch of the early labours of Penn's spiritual instructor, George Fox. But, whether because such criticism would not harmonise with the reverential character of his narrative, or from want of discrimination, he has not pointed out those differences between the two founders of Quakerism which it is most essential to observe. Never were two more dissimilar characters united by the tie of a common enthusiasm, and qualified by their very diversity to co-operate more effectively together; each possessing precisely those qualities in which the other was most deficient.

The journals of George Fox are perhaps scarcely calculated to be read with much profit to minds educated in the habits and notions of the present day. They have much resemblance, no doubt, to the similar record left by Wesley of his life and labours. But there is also much dissimilarity; and this, in a popular view at least, wholly to the advantage of the later of these eminent men. Wesley had over Fox all the superiority of a more kindly and liberal spirit, and a cultivated intellect.

And the great charm of his journals, independently of their religious interest, is their fine display of the operation of such a spirit and intellect, during the course of a long life of activity, in chastising the fundamental enthusiasm of the character. Without losing its seriousness, the reader traces that enthusiasm, year after year, becoming more tolerant, less captious, more comprehensive. The same cannot be said of the sterner father of Quakerism. As far as such comparison may be allowed, Wesley more resembled an apostle conveying the glad tidings to nations; Fox one of the prophets of the old law, and not himself a son of the prophets, but like him who was called from among the herdmen of Tekoa. From the day when he left the village alehouse in Leicestershire a changed man, resolved to 'forsake all, young and old, keep out of all, and be a stranger 'to all,' he never once looked back, or varied his course. From the day in which—having wrestled through his own first great spiritual fight, and become free to wrestle for others—he clambered Pendle Hill, driven by the impulse upon him he scarce knew whither—he had eaten or drunk, he says, little for many days and nights previous—and there saw in the spirit, as he looked towards the north, a great visionary army, prefiguring the conversions which were to commence in that quarter of England—the day, in short, of his prophetic vocation,—he can scarcely be said to have looked forward. His work was determined and cut out for him; it remained only to spend life in doing it, not to refine upon the fashion of it. Ever devoted to his one grand idea, ever pursuing it, insensible alike to temporal objects and to spiritual assaults of doubt or difficulty, he passed through the world little influenced, it must be added little improved, by contact with it—his career that of a narrow fanatic, if you will, to the last: but glorious in the pervading light of one transcendental principle. Were it not for this principle, the task of following George Fox in his wandering life would be a heavy one. Everywhere the same monotonous recital of persecutions and buffetings, varied only by the monotonous expressions of a religious sentiment which seems to have neither variety nor progress, and exultations over success destined to end in disappointment. For the vision of Pendle Hill was never realised. The dry bones were never brought together, the vast army never inspired with breath, by Fox and his fellow labourers. Instead of effecting a revolution, as they purposed, they only formed a sect of very moderate numbers, whose fame in the world has rather arisen from achievements out of the pale of their sectarianism than within it, and whose singular character and polity are now studied rather as fossil relics than as still surviving realities.

It is in their principle, and its indirect results, that the real interest of that history lies. That principle was two-fold, spiritual and practical. It embraced the spiritual doctrine of the inward light; on which, and its awful consequences, we have not now to dwell. It embraced also—immeasurably inferior in the estimation of such men as Fox, but as a direct and necessary corollary—the doctrine of religious freedom. For it has perhaps been scarcely enough remarked that with the Quakers alone, of all Christian communities, religious freedom is matter of faith, not matter of opinion. Those who rely implicitly on the inward light, must needs believe that all attempt to obstruct it from without is not simply unwarranted, or cruel, or impolitic, but actually blasphemous; that persecution, in Penn's own language, 'defeats God's own work of grace, and the invisible operation of His Eternal Spirit.' Other churches have advocated toleration, because they did not like being persecuted,—through policy—through confidence in a just cause—through a mild and Christian spirit, or simply through lukewarmness;—the Quakers alone with the unswerving earnestness of men who combat for their creed.

With Fox the doctrine of religious freedom was no doubt a secondary matter, partly from his absorption in the purely spiritual portion of his faith, partly also from what Mr. Dixon truly calls the 'imperiousness' of his character;—his 'Luciferian pride,' his antagonists phrased it. Could Fox have founded a commonwealth, we may almost conjecture that, at the expense of whatever evasion of principle, it would have fared ill therein with the benighted frequenters of mass-houses and steeple-houses. But, as we have said, Providence had prepared for the beginnings of this remarkable community two men singularly adapted to represent it under both its aspects. As Fox brought to all men's notice the great idea of the inward light, so did Penn its corollary of religious freedom. To his gentler, more impressive, more natural spirit—his saner intellect we should perhaps add—religious freedom was no cold deduction, but an object to be embraced, preached, and contended for with earnest and exclusive devotion.

For Penn's soul was not framed to dwell in or enforce the higher mysteries of Quakerism. The religious turn of his disposition was strong, but it was not, naturally, of the engrossing, fanatical cast.* He was sincerely enthusiastic, but not pro-

* We had written thus far before noticing that the distinction we have attempted here to draw, had struck in the same way a very impartial contemporary observer, Gerard Croese:—'Hoc ei' (Penn)

foundly so. He was also imitative, not original. His religious works have not wholly lost their popularity to this day: but it arises rather from the outpourings of a 'tender' spirit (to use the technical phrase of early Quakerism) and a pleasing style, than from much religious force or imagination. He, too, following those leather-jacketed apostles who were the objects of his admiration, recorded the visions and dreams of himself and others; but any one who compares those records with the wild poetry of Fox or Bunyan, will note the difference between the first-hand and second-hand enthusiast. He could, indeed, argue points of abstract doctrine with great success, and was fond of the exercise; but it was with the practical that his concern really lay. His peculiar energy was devoted to the exposition, both in life and teaching, of the great minor truth of freedom of conscience. In this point of view, his readiness, education, vivacity, and address—even the very lightheartedness which accompanied his sweet disposition and temper—together with his fortune and social position, proved of greater value to the struggling sect than qualities of a more prophet-like order. In this way his influence among them became established, somewhat at the expense of that enjoyed by the illiterate fathers of the community. Certainly the contrast was strong between the Leicestershire cobbler, whose learning was confined to reading print tolerably, and handwriting hardly at all, and who used an amanuensis for lack of clerkship, and the well-bred scholar and gentleman who sate at his feet.* Latterly it was evident that while Fox still wielded the spiritual sword of the Quaker papacy, Penn was master of the temporal. 'Does he not look like a young prince?' was the question that ran through the crowd, as Springett, Penn's eldest son, accompanied his father, amidst an admiring escort, to the Stadthouse of Amsterdam; and it was made a matter of reproach to Penn, amongst his ill-willers in the sect, that he seemed not altogether to repudiate the compliment.

'singulare erat, quòd ea quæ pertinent ad notitiam rerum divinarum et sacrarum multò quam reliqui leviora duceret, et se valdè quidem conscientiarum in religione vi et coactui et persecutioni opponeret.'

* Francis Bugg, the 'renegade Quaker of unsavoury name,' as Southey delighted to term him, was malicious enough to print poor George Fox's will *in extenso*, in order to establish the amount of his human learning. One of the codicils runs,—'Let Thomas Docker, that knoweth many of my episeles and writen books, which he did wright, com up to London to assist frends in sorting of my episelas and other writings; and give him a gine.'

What Fox's own feelings on the subject of Penn's exaltation may have been, there is no record to show: but certain it is that, while Penn's panegyrics on Fox are well known, there is no evidence of reciprocity on the part of the latter. It is a little curious—whether it arises from some jealous or contemptuous feeling, or may be after all the result only of the brief and note-like style of great part of Fox's journals—that, although he has frequent occasion to mention Penn, he never says a word respecting him beyond the mere insertion of his name. Like most founders of sects, Fox was jealous in the extreme of his own personal importance: '*reputans consistere omnia in sua personâ et consilio atque operâ, neque quicquam rectè fieri aut perfici sine se; ut nullibi non adesse, interesse, præesse cuperet,*' says Croese; who appears to surmise that one of Penn's motives for directing his views of conversion abroad was Fox's dislike of interference with his own supremacy at home.

Penn's notions of religious liberty seem to have been first formed under the teaching of Dr. Owen, the famous Independent Dean of Christ Church, Oxford—the tutor also of Locke: under whose tuition that distinguished House, probably, turned out more champions of the doctrine in question in three or four years, than it has since in two centuries. That so well born and educated a youth should have connected himself, at eighteen, with the as yet obscure and vulgar fanatics who followed the teaching of George Fox, was surprising even to his contemporaries; but less so to them than to us at the present day. Such anomalies were less remarkable in an age of general religious excitement. Equality has no agent so powerful as enthusiasm. Independently of mere political theories, Puritanism produced for a time the most practical mixture of ranks ever known in England. The Bible was the great leveller. Deeply studied by all classes, and not without the affectation of founding on it their social usages and polity, as well as their faith, it impressed on them the lesson of universal brotherhood more effectually than any other teacher could. The cultivated intellect was brought down perforce to the measure of the Scripture learning of the sect. But the uncultivated intellect was proportionally raised; being brought into contact, on this common ground, with intellects of higher refinement. Extravagant as the fanaticism of that age may have been, it is important, although not gratifying to our self-opinion, to note that, owing to the universal diffusion of Scriptural knowledge, it was restrained within limits which modern fanaticism overpasses with ease. Owing to the very inferior education of our multitudes in this

respect, religious aberrations are wont to assume more monstrous, grotesque, and heathenish aspects than in the old days which we are wont to call fanatical. If Thomas Münzer and George Fox were products of the Reformation, the followers of Joe Smith, in our latitudinarian times, probably exceed those who were gained by either of them. If Quakerism is nearly obsolete now, Shakers and Mormonites could not have existed in Western Europe in the seventeenth century.

Who can over-estimate the power of the man possessed with one idea? Even when friendless and unknown — without original talent or marked advantages of any kind — such a man has now and then achieved the greatest ends, by mere force of will and unity of aim. How much greater his strength when, like the youthful Penn, or Wilberforce, the modern whose character is almost a counterpart of Penn's, he is possessed of great adventitious aids — fortune, family, powerful friends, a singularly winning and attractive disposition, a happy and sanguine temperament, and abilities which, if of no very high order, are just of the serviceable kind, always ready for use, and never the worse for wear? The mere insensibility to considerations of earthly prudence, which such an enthusiast always possesses — as Penn did in the highest degree, — of itself removes an impediment to action, which can only be estimated when we consider from how many great enterprises we — the uninspired majority of the human race — are daily deterred simply by some motive of this order. Like Thalaba, in Southey's tale — the only dramatic character Southey ever drew, because its essential characteristic is that of Southey's own mind — he moves among a host of enemies unhurt and regardless of them; for they abound in half measures, and *arrière-pensées*, and conflicting interests, while he acts under one direct and unwavering impulse. Every one opposes him, but no one brings to the opposition that undivided force which nerves his attack. He gets within their fence — beats down their artificial flourishes — bursts asunder the meshes set to ensnare him. The shifting, uncertain politicians with whom he is brought into contact, having learnt his power, at last endeavour to make use of him; which generally ends in his making use of them; as Penn and Wilberforce, to a certain extent, did of the leading men of their respective periods — men as superior to themselves in ability as a Jesuit General to an ordinary field-preacher.

Yet all this energy and success are not inconsistent with the fact that Penn was not 'only wanting in 'strong sense,' as Mr. Macaulay most undeniably phrases it, but wanting also in many of the more ordinary qualities of men of his class. He had

nothing of the strong compulsive eloquence of some of them; and we incline to believe, with Burnet, that his talk must have been chiefly persuasive to those who were predetermined to be persuaded.* Ready enough it was, judging from his writings; fluent and discursive, abounding in examples and quotations, but wanting in raciness and vigour, and irritating from a sort of pertinacious and logical no-meaning—a combination of the greatest possible show of argument with the least amount of real reasoning.

In nothing is this combination more remarkable than in Penn's constitutional and legal disquisitions, in which his success is owing wholly to the reader's sympathy with his contest against tyranny,—certainly not to his manner of conducting it. The weakest portions of his hero's character, however, are precisely those which secure the greatest amount of Mr. Dixon's declamatory panegyric. A better instance cannot be found than in Penn's own account of the trial of himself and Mead for an unlawful assembly, in September, 1670; which account Mr. Dixon has amplified and embroidered until he has made it scarcely endurable, not by lawyers only, but by readers of ordinary moral sense and discrimination.

That Penn had, in fact, been guilty of a breach of the law, there could be no doubt at all. He was in the ordinary case of a man punishable under a bad law, who, while ready to submit to the punishment if awarded, thinks it not only his right, but his duty, to stave off a conviction by the use of every weapon which the law itself puts into the hand of the accused; and, if he cannot escape on a technical objection, to appeal, as the last resort, to the sympathies of his jurors, and induce them, if possible, to indulge their feelings by a violation of their oaths. Whether such a course as this be strictly reconcilable to the severe rules of ethics or no—whether or not it savours of the forbidden indulgence, so dear to human nature, under every form of palliation and excuse, of justifying the means by the end—at all events it is one which the best and bravest friends of humanity have been over and over again driven to adopt in their contests with legal oppression; and in which they are sure to

* Penn had 'a tedious luscious way of talking,' says Burnet; he 'spoke with spirit and vivacity,' says a much better judge, Swift; but there may be truth in both accounts, according to circumstances and interlocutors. We do not know that it has been noticed that Swift had (for him) an odd kindness for Penn; 'my old acquaintance,' as he calls him, when citing him as an authority for some fact about Pennsylvania, which Penn had mentioned to him in conversation.

have two classes of men on their side—those who detest oppression, and those who have no special affection for law.

‘Penn,’ says Mr. Dixon, ‘stood before his judges in this celebrated scene, not so much as a Quaker pleading for the rights of conscience, as an Englishman contending for the ancient and imprescriptible liberties of his race. The special law on which he was arraigned he knew very well that he had violated and intended again and again to violate. His religious friends took the same view of the case; they acknowledged the Conventicle Act to be in force according to the mere form of jurisprudence; but they contended that it was in direct contradiction to the divine laws, and therefore not binding. Better versed in his country’s history, Penn disputed its legality. He held it to be in equal hostility to the Bible and the great Charter. This, therefore, was the point to be brought to an issue; does an edict possess the virtue and force of law, even when passed by Crown and Parliament, which abolishes any one of the fundamental rights secured to the nation by the ancient constitution? . . . Thus Penn reasoned with himself:—If, as on ordinary* occasions we should feel bound to do, we now plead guilty, by our punishment this wicked act will acquire an additional force; but if we deny our guilt, *as we may with a good conscience*, and throw the burden of proof on the court, we shall show to all the world the evil *animus* of our persecutors; and we shall also be able to raise the question, whether this law be in harmony with the great Charter. If the court cannot show that it is, will a jury of Englishmen, fairly appealed to, convict? Should a precedent be set of juries refusing to convict under a bad law, the arm of tyranny would be at once paralysed.’ (P. 86.)

We must do Penn the justice to say that this singular piece of pleading is Mr. Dixon’s, not his; but substantially the representation it contains is correct. What Penn contended for was, the privilege of jurors to discard the restraint of law altogether, and the annulment of acts of the legislature by popular prejudice or violence—doctrines productive of such insecurity of rights that if they had generally prevailed, they could only have brought about ultimately the abolition of the ‘palladium of our liberties’ as an intolerable nuisance. These consequences were as nothing to Penn in the great contest wherein he was engaged: many will think he was right in so regarding them; but for us, after the lapse of 180 years, and in the enjoyment of rights which have been mainly preserved to us through the general adherence of juries to that principle of duty which Penn then urged them to disregard, it is really essential to remember that

* We wish Mr. Dixon had specified these occasions. We are not aware that such was Penn’s common practice, or George Fox’s, who was very ingenious in ‘picking holes’ in indictments.

there was another, besides the prisoners, who had a great social principle to maintain — even that 'venal minister of justice,' poor Recorder Howell, whose ill luck it was to hold those quarter sessions, and thereby to provoke, in the judgment of such as Mr. Dixon, the unmitigated hatred of later generations.

Perfectly at ease as to the constitutional and moral bearings of the case, Mr. Dixon is no less self-satisfied as to the law of it — although evidently indebted to natural light alone for his knowledge on the subject. 'To begin,' he says, with smart confidence, 'the date of the indictment is wrong: it (the meeting, we presume) 'should have been on the 14th, not the 15th.' Mr. Dixon has yet to learn the doctrine so tersely stated in Mr. Archbold's 'Practice of Criminal Pleading' — a little startling to the unlearned — that 'although time and place 'must be laid with certainty in an indictment, it never was 'necessary that they should be laid according to the truth!' 'The indictment asserted,' he proceeds, 'that the persons met 'together in arms: of this no proof was offered.' Of course not: Mr. Dixon might, for once, have taken Recorder Howell's law, who told the jury, 'that this allegation was only a matter 'of form; urging, that the man tried for clipping of money 'this present sessions, had the same words used in his indictment.' In short, without troubling our readers with more instances, both indictment and evidence were probably quite good enough to establish a charge which, beyond all question, was a true one — and, even if not, it is rather late to repeat the objections to them 180 years 'after verdict.'

As to the conduct of the trial, there is no doubt of the harshness of the courts of those days towards prisoners, and religious offenders more particularly: but Mr. Dixon ought to have remembered that Recorder Howell's notes of it are not extant; and, if they were, would probably tell a very different story from Penn's pamphlet. We are sorry to say the same of Mr. Phillimore, whose spirited abstract of the same case, in his 'History and Principles of the Law of Evidence,' would have lost nothing of its value if he had remembered the kind of account which criminals usually give of the conduct of their own trials. The Quakers were accustomed, not unnaturally, to make out a case of oppression against every judge whose unenviable office it was to administer evil laws against them. They never were content to play a humbler part than that of Christian and Faithful before Lord Hate-good in the city of Vanity. Those who try them are invariably portrayed as indulging at one time in threats of preposterous violence, and cowed, at another, into unaccountable silence by repartees

from the dock. Some of Penn's complaints, however, seem so trifling as to be scarcely creditable to his good sense — though entertained with indignant sympathy by Mr. Dixon. 'To add 'insult to cruelty,' says the latter, 'the prisoners were set aside ' (after being placed at the bar), while several cases of common 'felony were tried and disposed of.' This insulting cruelty, we fear, is still commonly practised at gaol deliveries. And it may be urged that, the 'common felons' might, possibly, have been thought aggrieved, if their ordinary precedence had been waived, in order that they might hear Penn and Mead lecture for two days on Magna Charta. Penn noted down, with care, every hasty and coarse expression which fell, not only from the judge, but the assistant bench of aldermen. The lord mayor is reported to have threatened that he would 'cut a juror's 'nose.' On this, Mr. Dixon observes that, 'slitting noses was a 'common punishment for offenders in those days. The young 'bloods of the court were especially fond of this pastime. 'Coventry, a leading member of Parliament, was set upon in 'the Haymarket, and his nose slit by Monmouth and his partisans.' As if the commotion which this outrage on Coventry excited was not proof enough that, so far from a 'common 'pastime,' it was almost an unheard-of action. 'Certainly,' the worried Recorder is made to say, 'it will never be well 'with us till something like the Inquisition is established in 'England;' and this passionate exclamation, we are solemnly told, is 'worth a thousand other facts for letting in light upon 'the spirit which ruled in high places under the exiled Stuarts!' Whatever else the poor Recorder may have done to merit Mr. Dixon's posthumous gibbeting, his last words to the jury were neither altogether unbecoming nor undeserved. 'I am sorry, 'gentlemen, you have followed your own judgments and opinions 'rather than the good advice which was given you. God keep 'my life out of your hands!'

The important feature of the case, however, was, that Penn, strong in purse and pertinacity, induced the jurors, whom the Bench had fined and committed for their 'perverse' verdict, to sue out a writ of habeas corpus for their discharge. How he reconciled this proceeding with the doctrine of non-resistance, it is not for us to say*; but the argument which followed

* William Mead, Penn's co-defendant on this occasion, an old Cromwellian soldier, was a stout partisan of that doctrine. Nevertheless it was reported of him, that, being challenged one night by three robbers in a lane, he laid about him with his oaken stick to their utter discomfiture. He was questioned on this account at a

established the illegality of such fines, and the irresponsibility of the all-powerful Twelve. This makes it, in Mr. Dixon's opinion, 'perhaps the most important trial which ever took place in England.' 'These trials,' he says, in his usual vein of hyperbole as to all that concerns his hero, 'gave a new meaning—infused a new life—into the institution of the jury.' 'From that day, the jury ceased to be a mere institution—it became a power in the State,'—and so forth. As if he had never heard of the series of forensic battles, from the days of Throckmorton to those of John Lilburne, in which the independence of the English juror, always distracted between the force of his oath and the force of his sentiments, which he calls his conscience, had been sometimes violated by judges, but as often respected. But he seems, in addition, to be wholly unaware that the very point which he truly regards as so important, had been established three years before, as far as the House of Commons could do it—which had resolved, in 'Chief Justice Keeling's case,' that 'the precedents and practice of fining jurors for verdicts are illegal.' Of course, after such a resolution, Penn's victory was little more than a slaying of the slain.

But—to return to our more general view of Penn's character—such men, to be termed truly happy, must die young. It is not only that they are subject, even more than other men, from the extensive and daring nature of their schemes, to the ordinary contingencies of fortune. Their own internal elements of success are eminently perishable. They cannot well withstand long contact with the world, and especially with fame and prosperity. As the mere impulse which gave their character its force wears out, like other vehement springs of action, while its weak points remain, and grow more prominent, they decline to that secondary stage of eminence in which they are worshipped as heroes, but no longer really followed as leaders,—becoming, in their lifetime, great names, used by newer men for their own objects. At forty, Penn's work was really done. He had raised the despised and persecuted Quakers to a numerous, comfortable, and even patronised sect,—he had fought for liberty of conscience until, even through the partial instrumentality of tyranny itself, it was established on a footing from which it was never to be dislodged in this country,—he had founded his transatlantic commonwealth, and started her in her

monthly meeting: 'The Spirit of the Lord was upon me,' was his defence, 'and I could have beaten seven of them.' Of course the accusers had no more to say.

great career of prosperity. Thenceforward, to all eyes but those of the indiscriminating panegyrist, his life exhibits but the common spectacle of declining influence along with declining powers. His supremacy in his own sect, as well as his authority out of it, whatever Mr. Dixon may say to the contrary, were materially shaken by two causes—the political events which led to the Revolution, and his own relaxation from the strictness of his early enthusiasm.

Penn's original connexion with James the Second is one which reflects no discredit on either party. On this point we fully agree with Mr. Dixon. James had been his father's friend—the friend and patron, as far as his means went, of all connected with his favourite sea service. At Sir William's death, 'James undertook the office of guardian and protector to the young man—an office which he honourably and faithfully discharged. This was the simple and natural origin of that connexion between the Quaker subject and the Catholic prince, which afterwards created so much scandal.' James stood by Penn in Charles the Second's lifetime, both to protect his personal liberty and to befriend him in his family affairs, at a period when it is absurd to suspect the Duke of any special political object in supporting him. Thus much must be said for a prince whose evil qualities may not have been exaggerated, but whose good ones have as certainly not had justice done them.

But when James and Penn came together, the former as king, the latter as the head of a religious party in England, and the founder of a successful colony in America, their relations to each other became far different from those of early kindness and gratitude. Each was planning great objects—the monarch, the establishment of his religion; the Quaker, the establishment of religious freedom. Each endeavoured to use the other as a valuable instrument towards his own ends. But James had the advantage in this contest of policy. As his designs were deeper and his conscience less scrupulous, so he had, in addition, the seductions of Court favour and royal condescension at his command. Penn's mind was not of an order to resist them, still less to dissemble and affect to yield to them, in order only to secure a firmer hold for projects of personal ambition or cherished policy.

Mr. Macaulay and others have pointed out the peculiar motive which prompted James in seeking alliance with the Quakers and Penn—the features in which their legal position agreed with that of the Roman Catholics, and in which both differed from the other Non-conformists: a distinction all-important towards understanding this portion of history, but which Mr.

Dixon omits to notice altogether. But it would be unjust to Penn to suppose that he was himself actuated by any policy of this kind. His sympathies were, of course, with suffering Friends, but his object was universal freedom of conscience.

'Penn,' says Mr. Dixon, 'believed the king sincere when he declared himself opposed to every kind of religious tests, and to every species of penal laws; and though it became the fashion after the Revolution to consider this apparent liberality in matters of conscience to be a mere Jesuitical feint to engage the unwary to support his policy in favour of the Catholics, abundant evidence remains to show that this was not the case.'

If Mr. Dixon really chooses himself to believe that James was sincerely and philosophically promoting spiritual freedom on this side of the Channel, while his ally, Louis, was dragooning heretics on the other, he is probably a singular specimen of such one-sided credulity. Our defence of Penn, or apology for him, would rest on very different grounds — not that he was right in believing in the sincerity of James — not even that he did believe in it — but that he deemed himself acting for the best in joining those who were standing up for freedom of conscience, whatever their motives might be, against the champions of a Church-and-State constitution which was kept together by a system of religious restrictions. Liberty of conscience not only appears, but is so holy a thing, even independent of the peculiar Quaker view of it, that it seems well nigh a sin to take part with those who would obstruct it, however valuable their ulterior objects; or to offer opposition to one who invokes its principles, however unsound may be his adoption of them. James was not only professing those principles, but acting up to his professions. He was in the act of striking off the chains of sufferers for conscience' sake, and placing them all alike under the common shelter of his prerogative. Whatever might be the abstract merits of the Whigs as friends of constitutional liberty, there could be no doubt that at this time they were deeply involved in the guilt of persecution. The Church, which had taken so strong an attitude against the usurpations of James, showed no trustworthy signs of relaxing in her persecution of Non-conformists; and Church and Non-conformists alike were ready to harass Quakers, and almost prepared to exterminate Roman Catholics.

Penn's choice, therefore, needs no justification, when the matter is regarded from his own point of view. But the people of England decided the other way, judging, as they always do, by men and motives, not by abstract rules. And they were right; or all subsequent history has been written in vain, and European

progress is a delusion. Never did this popular instinct show itself more irresistible, or more determined, than on the eve of the Revolution. The very prisoners whose chains were struck off refused the right hand of fellowship to their liberators. Fourteen hundred Quakers had been discharged from gaol by James; and Penn had so far prevailed on the gratitude of the body, as to procure from the Public Meeting the famous address of May, 1687, thanking the king for his exercise of the dispensing power—the greatest triumph which the royal policy had obtained. But the Quakers were Englishmen after all. Supposing them, like certain recent historians of the Dissenters, to have argued for an instant, that ‘When I am attacked by assassins, if Satan’s eldest son were to pass by, and drag my adversaries off me, and rescue me from their murderous hands, I know not that it would be any crime to thank him for his merciful interposition’—they seem to have felt repentance almost immediately after for this concession, and no less dissatisfaction with him who had led them into it. Nor were Penn’s courtier-like ways at this period—his daily visits to Whitehall, his position as the ‘King’s friend,’ conceived to have more influence and, therefore, provoking more jealousy even than his ostensible councillors—likely to be long popular with a sect of democratic enthusiasts, such as he had helped to make them.

That Penn did at this time lose popularity and influence with them appears to us fully established, although Mr. Dixon and Mr. Forster (the author of the pamphlet ‘William Penn and T. B. Macaulay,’ whom Mr. Dixon closely follows throughout this controversy) think it due to their hero, we scarcely see why, to dispute it. Mr. Macaulay’s only authority for the statement ‘that Penn’s own sect looked coldly on him, and requited his services with obloquy,’ is, says Mr. Dixon, ‘Gerard Croese, a Dutchman, who never was in England in his life, and whose work the Society of Friends have never recognised.’ Mr. Dixon is not lucky in his conjectural assertions. Croese was much in England—he was once invited to take charge of a congregation at Norwich. We do not know what is meant by his work not being ‘recognised’ by the Quakers:—neither sects nor individuals are apt to ‘recognise’ impartial accounts of themselves. But the matter seems to rest on much better inferential evidence than the statement of Croese, although it is not the only one. Penn’s own ‘Answer to Popple,’ so often quoted by his biographers, is evidently an apology, addressed to his own partisans, and justifying himself against this unpopularity. The letter of that ‘Secretary to the Lords Commissioners

'of Trade and Plantations,' written in the last days before William's landing, and when the Court was trying all kinds of apology and appeal, was plainly meant to draw out Penn, and afford him an opportunity for the reply; and the whole correspondence may be regarded, in Downing Street phrase, as 'semi-official.'*

But then, say Messrs. Forster and Dixon, the records of the Society show no signs of such a change. 'Penn was, at this time, in regular attendance at the monthly meetings, and was elected to the highest offices of the body.' No doubt of it. The formal records of the Society are the last place to examine for the real sentiments of its members towards an important and useful personage in it. 'We spare him,' says a bitter enemy of his, writing in the assumed character of a leading Quaker, 'for a tool. He keeps near the Court. He is popular; and can write letters, and give directions concerning elections: he can tell who will serve us at Court and Council, and in Parliament; and can gloss over our principles.' But Mr. Dixon himself, only a few pages down, gives the strongest confirmation of the view he is opposing: with the difference only, that he is speaking of the reign of William, when Penn's fall had become still greater.

'It is curious,' he says, 'to find, that the men who stood by him in his darkest hours of trial were, with some staunch exceptions, not the persons who shared his religious opinions, but the more distinguished order of courtiers, statesmen, divines, and philosophers,—men like Rochester and Ranelagh, Trenchard and Popple, Tillotson and Locke. Many of his own sect for a time looked coldly on his sufferings; and it does not appear that their indifference was entirely removed until he was restored to his worldly rank (by the act in council of 1694 re-appointing him to his government of Pennsylvania). They had no complaint to make against his morals or his life, they only pretended to condemn the too active part he had taken in the affairs of the world.'

* We are bound to say that there is a kind of fatality about the 'Penn Controversy.' No one who engages in it is so fortunate as to be strictly accurate in his assertions or quotations. In the passage above cited, where Mr. Dixon makes the rash statement that Croese was never in England, he refers, without any remark, to a passage of Mr. Macaulay, which utterly contradicts him (vol. i. p. 506.), where the historian quotes Croese as an eye-witness of Penn's levées;—'Vidi quandoque de hoc genere hominum non minus *'bis centum.'*' But this is a misquotation. In the edition of 1695, the only one we know of, the word is '*visi*,' not *'vidi*, and the change of a letter makes all the difference; nor is it at all probable that Croese was *at that time* in England.

We cannot wholly pass over this part of Penn's life without noticing what Mr. Dixon calls his 'extra chapter on the Macaulay charges,' being, in fact, a repetition of Mr. Forster's arguments against those charges. How far Mr. Dixon has a right to sit in judgment on men for alleged inaccuracies of detail, our readers are, by this time, qualified to judge. And the tone and temper of his criticism are such as we are sorry to see imported into any literary controversy. The historical questions really at issue may be briefly disposed of. Three principal instances have been alleged, in which Penn is said to have been employed by the court in discreditable negotiations. The first is the case of Kiffin: and here Mr. Dixon and Mr. Forster, while quoting Kiffin's memoirs of himself against Mr. Macaulay, have both contrived to omit the very passage on which Mr. Macaulay's statement is grounded! The second, is that of Magdalen College: as to which, the apologists wholly fail to perceive that the conduct ascribed to Penn is matter of inference, not of direct proof: and the unfavourable inference, which was drawn long before Mr. Macaulay wrote, remains altogether untouched by their arguments. The third, is that of the 'Maids of Taunton:' and here, on the other hand, there can be no doubt that the discovery of the Pinney cash-book has greatly altered the state of the question. Indeed, the story, as against Penn, seems, in itself, so improbable, that we are quite ready to be content with a very moderate amount even of manuscript disproof. In the meantime, we are hardly satisfied with the subsidiary arguments with which Mr. Dixon has chosen to overload the question. His several pleas seem to be, 1. That the Maids were traitors. 2. That the sale of traitors' pardons was a regular profession. 3. That the Maids of Honour were, probably, goodnatured creditors. 4. That there is no proof that Penn accepted the commission. 5. *That it was not William Penn, but George Penn.* He would have saved some pages of letter-press, had he but remembered the moral of the venerable jest concerning the mayor, who proposed to offer Henry the Fourth seven reasons for not firing a salute. 'In the first place, we have no powder.' 'Enough said,' replied the monarch: 'I excuse you the other six.'

Nor were Penn's political weaknesses the only features of his character which weaned from him the affections of the sterner and more serious of his sect. His style of living was a constant subject of jealousy with the evil-minded, and of reprobation with the earnest. Penn, certainly, shook off the ascetic fit of youthful devotion at a very early period. Indefatigable in travel and exertion, he did not appear to conceive

that any particular self-denial was called for in his ordinary course of life. He was a man of easy habits and expensive tastes — nay, he had a certain partiality for creature-comforts, such as, according to some censors, has lurked among the orthodox and regular members of his persuasion from that day to this. His setting up a coach was a passage almost as memorable in the history of the Friends, as the same daring action by his contemporary, Secretary Pepys, in his own. ‘And if he says,’ exclaims the satirical Bugg, ‘that his is no coach, but only a leathern conveniency, yet, as I have heard, he hath curious buildings and good wine, waiting men and waiting maids, and oftentimes good and dainty dishes of meat.’ Bugg was rightly informed. Mr. Dixon has given us a sketch of the governor’s family life in his American dwelling, which is both tempting and picturesque: it affords, moreover, some insight into the causes of the dilapidation of the Penn estates — for all the profusion here described occurred in a residence of less than two years.

‘The front of the house, sixty feet long, faced the Delaware, and the upper windows commanded a magnificent view of the river and of the opposite shores of New Jersey. The depth of the manor-house was forty feet, and on each of the wings the various out-houses were so disposed as to produce an agreeable and picturesque effect. The brewhouse, a large wooden building covered with shingles, — Penn was not unused to the good old Saxon drink, — was at the back, some little distance from the mansion, and concealed among the trees. The house itself stood on a gentle eminence; it was two stories high, and was built of fine brick and covered with tiles. The entrance led, by a large and handsome porch and stone steps, into a spacious hall, extending nearly the whole length of the house, which was used on public occasions for the entertainment of distinguished guests, and the reception of the Indian tribes. The rooms were arranged in suites, with ample folding-doors, and were all wainscotted with English oak. A simple but correct taste was observable throughout; the interior ornaments were chaste, and the oaken capital at the porch was appropriately decorated with the carving of a vine and clusters of grapes. The more elaborate of these decorations were sent from England by the governor. The gardens were the wonder of the colony for their extent and beauty. A country-house, with an ample garden, was the governor’s passion, and he spared neither care nor money to make the grounds of Pennsburg a little Eden. He procured from England and from Scotland the most skilful gardeners he could find. . . .

‘The furnishing of Pennsburg was to match. Mahogany was a luxury then unknown; but his spider-tables and high-backed chairs were of the finest oak. An inventory of the furniture is still extant; there were a set of Turkey-worked chairs, arm-chairs for ease, and

couches with plush and satin cushions for luxury and beauty. In the parlour stood the great leathern chair of the proprietor; in every room were found cushions and curtains of satin, camlet, damask, and striped linen, and there is a carpet mentioned as being in one apartment, though at that time such an article was hardly ever seen except in the palaces of kings. His side-board furniture was also that of a gentleman; it included a service of silver, plain, but massive-like, and white china, a complete set of Tonbridge ware, and a great quantity of damask tablecloths and fine napkins. The table was served as became his rank, plainly but plentifully. . . .

His cellars were well stocked; canary, claret, sack and Madeira, being the favourite wines consumed by his family and their guests. Besides these nobler drinks, there was a plentiful supply, on all occasions of Indian or general festivity, of ale and cider. Penn's own wine seems to have been Madeira, and he certainly had no dislike to the temperate pleasures of the table. In one of his letters to his steward Sotcher, he writes, "Pray send us some two or three smoked haunches of venison and pork; get them from the Swedes; also some smoked shads and beefs;" adding, with delicious unction, "the old priest at Philadelphia had rare shads." (P. 380, &c.)

We find, also, that, among other gentlemanlike and expensive tastes, the Governor had that *penchant* for the pleasures of the stable which has been inherited by many excellent Quaker families of modern times. He stocked his province with brood mares as far as his means would allow, and took out with him in 1699 'the magnificent colt Tamerlane, by the celebrated 'Godolphin Barb.'

All this, according to sound and reasonable views, might not be inconsistent with the elevated parts of Penn's character. His superiority to the scruples of more ordinary precisians might rather be a proof of the higher degree of spirituality which he had attained, dispensing him from compliance with the beggarly elements of minute observance. But the change came too early. The contrast was too strong between Penn's luxurious living and the gaol diet or penurious travelling fare of the many hundred sufferers or missionaries for the truth, who constituted as yet the effective battalions of the Quaker army, and with whom Penn himself fraternised at the monthly meetings,—between Penn's actual practice and the eloquent asceticism of 'No Cross, No Crown,' and the other works of his enthusiastic days. On some points, also, and those favourite scruples of the Sect, he always remained but a wet Quaker. Though firm as a rock on the subject of oaths, a steady stickler against titles, and ready to go to the stake on the principle of the hat, he was yielding in the article of dress, which seems to have afforded the sorest of all temptations to

saints in that age of lace and embroidery. 'The ladies of his family dressed like gentlewomen,—wore caps and buckles, silk gowns and golden ornaments. Penn had no less than four wigs in America, all purchased in the same year, at a cost of nearly twenty pounds.' Yet the periwig had been a special cause of offence to the early Quakers. Did they not boast (says Leslie) 'how John Millner, a Friend about Northampton, a wig maker, left off the trade, and was made to burn one in his prentice's sight, and print against it? And that John Hall, a gentleman of Northumberland, being convinced, sitting at a meeting, was shaken by the Lord's power, plucked off and threw down his wig.' And was not Richard Richardson moved to make an especial 'declaration against wigs,' in which, among other things, he shows distinctly, from the case of Elisha in the Second Book of Kings, that they formed no part of the prophetic costume?

These were partly the causes—we are sorry to say that worldly policy might furnish another—which made so many of his religious partisans shrink from supporting their eminent leader during the saddest period of his fortunes, from 1688 to 1694: when his substance fell to decay, the wife of his first affection was lost to him, and, from having been a royal favourite, he became the object of political persecution,—when, in his own words, 'his enemies had darkened the very air against him.' More grievous to read of, because more wholly undeserved, was the treatment which Penn had to experience from his subject colonists,—the first Anglo-Pennsylvanians. We know few chapters in the long and dreary history of the ingratitude of mankind towards its benefactors, more painful than Mr. Dixon's account of the persevering injustice and shameless exactions which were the requital of all his devotion to his 'Holy Experiment.' He had, indeed, sacrificed to it the best part of his fortune as well as of his life. He estimated his loss on the first foundation of Pennsylvania, at 120,000*l.*,—a sum which should be much more than doubled for the purpose of fair comparison with similar expenditure in our times, but which, if doubled, would nearly equal the sum by which Parliament, in 1842, found it advisable to cover the losses sustained in the experiment (rather philosophical than holy) of that day,—the colonisation of South Australia. So mistaken is the fashionable notion that the art of colonisation was either more perfect or less expensive in his time than ours. So uniform the evidence to the fact, that a colony cannot be established on any great scale without preliminary sacrifices. But Penn's profuse expenditure had at all events forced the Friendly City into pre-

mature wealth and greatness. The only effect produced on the mind of its drab-coated inhabitants, seems to have been the persuasion that a source, which had yielded so much, might be made to yield more by draining. In 1693, when Penn's affairs at home were at the lowest ebb, he was roused by the Crown's supposed intention to abrogate the charter of Pennsylvania, and form a common government of all the northern colonies. But he was actually in want of money to make the journey. Could he obtain it by borrowing small sums from the wealthier of his colonists, secured on the quit rents of the province? He wrote to an old ally in Philadelphia to make this proposal, but not a man came forward to help him. 'They said they loved him much, but they had no mind to lend money.' He went at last — but he had not been two years in the colony (1699—1701) when he wanted to return home in order to oppose the 'Colony Bill,' by which it was designed to transfer the proprietary rights to the Crown — a transfer which Penn deprecated, from his still prevailing desire to carry his own plans into execution; but which affected him much less than the settlers, whose dread of their proposed assignment to King Stork was natural and extreme. But when he consulted the Assembly for means to effect the voyage and negotiation, he obtained nothing but 'a list of demands which were equally insulting and unjust.' He was forced to sell land to cover his expenses home. His correspondent, Logan, thus briefly described the feeling of the colony: — 'There are few,' he said to Penn in one of his letters, 'that think it sin to *hawl any thing they can from thee.*' They invaded his rights, they seized his land, they withheld his rents.

Their affairs, in the absence of the founder, fell speedily into disorder; his few remaining rights were seriously menaced; and religious disputes began to disturb a community in which his measures had hitherto prevented, at least, this one fertile seed of strife from germinating. He became anxious to go over once more. 'I assure thee,' he wrote to his agent, 'if the people would only settle 600*l.* a year upon me as governor, I would hasten over. . . . Cultivate this among the best Friends.' But the best Friends would do nothing. A governor who expected to receive instead of paying by no means suited their views.

But, in the very decline of his life, one gleam of hopefulness was permitted to bless the vision of the departing founder. An earnest remonstrance, which he addressed in 1710 to the people of Pennsylvania, produced, we are told, 'a sudden revolution in his favour.' 'The colony was stung with the mild

‘reproaches of its founder, now in his old age, enduring poverty brought on by his too great liberality; and the session which ensued was the most cordial and harmonious, as well as the most useful, in the history of the Assembly.’ This is a pleasant reminiscence wherewith to conclude his eventful history; and it is satisfactory also to reflect that, even in a pecuniary point of view, his sacrifices remained ultimately not unrecompensed to his family. For some years before his death he had been ready to sell the government to the Crown. But he insisted on keeping the charter and fundamental laws; and on these terms Queen Anne’s Government would not treat, because their great object, like King William’s, was the union of the North American colonies for purposes of defence, which the peculiar constitution of Pennsylvania, and its central position, impeded. The negotiation, therefore, came to nothing. By Penn’s will, in 1710, he left the remnant of his English and Irish estates to his children by his first wife, Pennsylvania to those by the second. It had been worth nothing to him until the last year or two previous, and he naturally regarded it as the inferior fund.

‘He had no conception of the enormous increase of value which twenty years of peace, following on the Treaty of Utrecht, would give to Pennsylvania. Hannah’s children became the lords proprietors of the colony, and the younger branch of his family stood before the world as the more conspicuous representatives of the Great founder.’

We believe that they ultimately received 130,000*l.* for it from the State of Pennsylvania.

Misfortune, however, never fell on one better prepared to meet it. Penn was not so much fortified against it by philosophy, or even by religious firmness, as by one of those happy temperaments which, though susceptible of every impression, are little apt to be profoundly affected by any. Neither loss of fortune, friends, nor political interest, nor the disappointment of high dreams of the purest ambition, seem to have permanently influenced his spirits, or could even for the moment ruffle his temper. He even preserved the same placid and radiant demeanour towards the outer world! The gaiety of disposition which had been the great charm of his society in youth had something in it which moved to reverence in later years, when those who witnessed it thought of the actions and sufferings of the man. He retained to the last that serene and somewhat self-satisfied look, that *air béat*, as the French call it, which marks his portraits; and the period of decaying intellect which preceded his death, however painful for others to witness, seems

to have been passed by him in a long dream of tranquil and child-like enjoyment.

Such was Penn, not in his mythical character, but a being of mixed strength and weakness, who by a combination of external facility of disposition, with pertinacity of resolution, made a greater impression on his age, and did more for posterity, than men of far more powerful intellect. What was he in domestic life? It would be of little use to ask Mr. Dixon. He paints without shade. He patches up every small fragment of biography he can find, to compound a hero not only of opposite but of scarcely reconcilable qualities. That Penn was of blameless life and very affectionate disposition is readily granted; he also wrote, and printed, good advice to his children. But far more than this is needed, to complete a character of real interest in respect of the qualities which pertain to home. Every man has his several vocation in this world. That of the enthusiastic missionary is one, that of the *conjux et paterfamilias* another. It is idle to represent the same man as a model of perfection in both. Penn's temperament was restless, his love of variety and action strong, qualities which he shared with most men of his stamp, and which made toil and privation matters of less self-denial to him than silence and retirement. But the man who is fit for this work, cannot be at the same time bound by the enchanted tie of really strong domestic attachment; cannot be devoted to the society of one companion of the heart: cannot watch, with engrossing interest, the development of a second self. His choice should be celibacy. Wisdom that crieth daily in the streets, cannot possibly dwell with children at her knees. Passionate as may have been Penn's early attachment to the fair 'Guli Springett,'* Mr. Dixon's heroine, it appears that after the first three years of their marriage she rarely accompanied him in his incessant wanderings. Thenceforth their lot was mainly separate; and however duly fond of each other, they could never have lived in that constant communion of the heart which is the portion of more ordinary couples. Mr. Dixon wants words to paint the violence of her husband's sorrow when she died. Yet it is not the less the fact, that before two years were over, and that, too,

* We hardly know a more amusing instance of the modern art of weaving a fashionable biography out of scanty materials, than the 'charming history of unsuccessful love,' which Mr. Dixon has got up from poor Thomas Ellwood's little confessions about this lady. But it is hardly fair on the amiable Friend to speak of Guli as his 'lady-love,' when he escorted her to her uncle Herbert's (p. 132.), at which time he was engaged to Mary Ellis.

while his other cares and disappointments were pressing most heavily upon him, he married Hannah Callowhill, at fifty-four, and became the father of a second flourishing family. Nor do his children seem to have contributed much to his happiness, or towards the promotion of his views. What, indeed, were the achievements of the great philanthropist to them? Judging as children ordinarily judge of their parents in this unheroic world, they probably thought of him as a father whose heart had been far too exclusively devoted to other cares, to be to them either a confidential friend, or the object of the romantic filial worship of youth; and who had wasted on his wild schemes the fortune on which they counted for the gratification of their own desires in life. The eldest and most promising, Springett, died young. Of Letitia, the daughter, who married Mr. Aubrey, Mr. Dixon tells us little, except that she seems to have considered residence with her father in America as a very unwelcome banishment. William, Guli's only remaining son, took to bad courses, became profligate and debauched, was expelled by the Friends, deserted his family, and, in common phrase, went near to break his father's heart; but Penn's was not a heart of that order of fragility. His second family were children of his old age.

We have been the less scrupulous in dealing with Mr. Dixon's qualifications as a biographer, because he has himself so unscrupulously attacked others;—because he throws about charges of ignorance and malevolence against those who have regarded his hero's character from a different point of view from himself, with a petulance which would be unbecoming even if his own performance was as exact and conscientious as it is superficial. His want of the habit of discriminating criticism would greatly unfit him for the execution of such a work, even if he wrote less obviously with an object—in order to support particular views and please particular judges, at the same time captivating idle readers by romantic effect. But he is not without good qualities as a writer. His style seems to be easy and good, when not disfigured by an affectation of smartness, and there is life in his narrative and vigour in his descriptions. We would not do him the injustice which he so lavishly inflicts on others, of supposing that the errors into which his eagerness for defending his hero has led him, were in any degree intentional. As for the charge of irreverence towards the memory of a hero, which he so liberally dispenses, we are quite ready to submit to our share of it. Hero-worship is only possible so long as the hero remains a 'myth.' When he is dragged out of this reverential obscurity, it is neither manly nor philosophical to judge of him otherwise than of another man. Nor can we accept, without

much qualification, the claims which are put forward on behalf of Penn to the devout observance of posterity. As the champion of religious freedom, he was prominent in a great cause; but it must be remembered that it was also the winning cause. Notwithstanding partial checks, it was a cause rapidly advancing, even in his time. The days of the old system of intolerance were evidently numbered. And on the whole it may be doubted whether the efforts of Penn and his friends contributed so much to its success as the extravagances of the sect did to retard it. In our view, the great interest attached to Penn's memory is of a wider, but at the same time of a more questionable, kind. It arises out of those general conceptions of the earthly destiny of men, and the mode of adapting them for its fulfilment, of which the particular tenet of religious freedom, though most present to Penn's mind, formed a portion only. To make the first spring of common as well as individual action love, not fear; — to regard men rather as glorious than as fallen creatures; — as all in their degree influenced by that inward light, to quench or deny which is practical anarchy, as well as blasphemy; — these were visions so bold, and so new to the religious spirit of the time, that it is scarcely to be wondered at, if the Friends themselves failed to appreciate and express clearly the principle which they involved, and if the world altogether failed to understand it. Yet that principle fought its way onward, with what vast extension of influence the whole system of modern legislation and policy bears witness. Its progress has been diversified with strange exaggerations and fatal errors. It has raised men's minds from servile abasement to freedom and light: but it has also exalted them to a pinnacle of self-worship, from which they have speedily plunged again into grovelling degradation. It has founded great republics, and overthrown flourishing States, abolished racks, thrown open prisons, and erected guillotines. Often thrust into the background by violent reaction towards the opposite doctrine — often distorted and abused by its own partisans — it still continues to make way; and its course is more and more clearly descried in fancy, both by the enthusiastic and the timid, as tending to the dissolution and reconstruction of human society.

- ART. X. — 1. *Handbuch der Chemie.* Von LEOPOLD MELIN. Vierte umgearbeitete und vermehrte Auflage. V. Band, 8vo. Heidelberg: 1850.
2. *Handwörterbuch der reinen und angewandten Chemie.* Redigirt von Dr. HERMANN KOLBE. Vierten Bandes, Siebente Lieferung, 8vo. Braunschweig: 1850.
3. *Ausführliches Handbuch der Analytischen Chemie.* Von HEINRICH ROSE. 2 Bänden, 8vo. Braunschweig: 1851.
4. *Cours de Chimie Générale.* Par J. PELOUZE et E. FREMY. 3 tomes, grand 8vo. Paris: 1850.
5. *Traité de Chimie Organique.* Par JUSTUS LIEBIG. 3 tomes, 8vo. Paris: 1840—1844.
6. *Chemie der Organischen Verbindungen.* Von CARL LÖWIG. Gr. 8vo. Braunschweig: 1850.
7. *Elements of Chemistry, including the Applications of the Science in the Arts.* By T. GRAHAM, F.R.S.L. and E. Second Edition. 8vo. London: 1850.
8. *An Introduction to the Atomic Theory.* By CHARLES DAUBENY, M.D., F.R.S. Oxford: 1850. Post 8vo. Pp. 502.
9. *Geschichte der Chemie.* Von Dr. HERMANN KOPP. 4 Bänden, gr. 8vo. Braunschweig: 1843—1847.
10. *Lehrbuch der Pharmaceutischen Technik.* Von Dr. FRIEDRICK MOHR. Gr. 8vo. Braunschweig: 1851.
11. *Handbuch der technischen Chemie.* Von ERNST LUDWIG SCHUBARTH. 3 Bänden, 8vo. Berlin: 1839.
12. *Chemical Technology, or Chemistry applied to the Arts and to Manufactures.* By F. KNAPP. 3 vols. 8vo. 1848—1850.
13. *A Treatise on Poisons.* By ROBERT CHRISTISON, M.D., F.R.S.E. Fourth Edition. 8vo. Edinburgh: 1845.
14. *The Chemistry of Vegetable and Animal Physiology.* By Dr. G. J. MULDER. Translated from the Dutch by Dr. FROMBERG; with an Introduction and Notes, by JAMES F. W. JOHNSTON, F.R.S. 8vo. Edinburgh and London: 1849.
15. *Lehrbuch der Physiologischen Chemie.* Von Prof. Dr. C. G. LEHMANN. Zweiter Band. Leipzig: 1850.
16. *Lehrbuch der Chemischen und Physiologischen Geologie.* Von Dr. GUSTAV BISCHOF. Zweiter Bandes, Vierte Abtheilung. 8vo. Bonn: 1850.

17. *Årsberättelser om Framstegen i Physik och Kemi.* Af J. J. BERZELIUS. 27 digra band. Stookholm: 1821 till 1848.
18. *Minnè*, af J. J. BERZELIUS. Af M. af PONTIN. Stookholm: 1849.

AMONG the modern sciences which, in their nature and progress, partake most of the character of the advancing material civilisation of the nineteenth century, Chemistry holds the first rank. Of that advancing civilisation it may even be said to form a main part or element. One of its special duties is to discover hidden and unknown properties and uses in things — to lay open the unsuspected riches of kingdoms. It suggests also, or presides over, all those new and growing arts — not purely mechanical — by which wealth and power are conferred upon the countries that foster them, or by which future dominion and rapid pre-eminence are promised.

No branch of positive knowledge can boast a history so full of interest and romance as this, or one which presents a more tempting field for a literary excursion, either to a writer or to a reader. The more recent progress of the science, however, and its actual position, are our present object; and we must refer those readers, who desire to study the history in detail, to the well known ‘History of Chemistry,’ by Dr. Thomson, or to the more elaborate German work of Dr. Kopp, the title of which will be found among the books at the head of the present article.

There are several extemporaneous or off-hand ways, in which the progress of modern chemistry, in extent and importance, may be judged of, by persons who either have never been familiar with its principles, or who have ceased for a time to follow its advance. Among these may be mentioned, as one of the easiest, a brief consideration of the existing literature of the science. Respecting this point, several things are deserving of notice; and first stands the number of new books, which are yearly issuing from the press in the various countries of Europe and America, devoted purely to the illustration of its principles. We have quoted the names of only a few of the most recent. The bare titles of the most trustworthy treatises, published even within the last five years, would have filled several pages. In addition to that of Graham, mentioned in our list, we have — all of nearly equal authority — in our own language, those of Thomson, Brande, Turner, Fownes, and Gregory; while some of the continental ~~languages~~ are far more rich in systematic chemistry. Meantime, the latest and most complete of these publications, on the pure science, exhibit a striking evidence of

progress in this particular, — whereas some twenty years ago three or four octavo volumes, as in the systems of Murray and Thomson, sufficed to contain a full record of all known principles and facts of importance, mixed up with at least their own bulk of theoretical disquisitions and speculations. Six or more octavos, as in the work of Gmelin, now scarcely afford space enough to record the principles and facts alone. Speculations and theoretical disquisitions are far more abundant than ever; but they find their appropriate place in the many periodical journals and in the multiplied transactions of learned bodies which regularly appear in almost every European language.

Again, in relation to the actual extent of the science, and the positive effects produced by its progress, much may be gathered from the size of the body of literature which is now devoted to the explanation of its various *applied* branches. Not only has the range of pure chemistry, as a whole, become so vast that scarcely any one mind can grasp it, or, in a fair measure, master its details; while, by way of simplification, separate divisions have successively been made into mineral and organic, and the latter again into animal and vegetable chemistry; but so many new arts have arisen from the application of its principles to useful and ornamental purposes, and so many new books are devoted to each of these arts exclusively, that a really large body of applied chemical literature has gradually accumulated on the shelves of our libraries. To the present article we have prefixed the titles of only two works — those of Schubart and Knapp — which profess to treat generally of the applications of the science to all the, so-called, useful arts of life. It would fill a bookseller's catalogue to name only the latest published and best books which relate to all the separate or special branches. We possess voluminous treatises, not only on large subjects, such as Medical Chemistry, Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Forensic Chemistry, Agricultural Chemistry, Chemical Geology, Chemical Mineralogy, &c.; but on more limited topics, such as the manufacture of iron, of porcelain, of glass, of soda, soap, vinegar, white lead, the chloride of lime, the sulphates of iron and of copper, the mineral acids, and the thousand other compounds which the chemical arts and chemical pharmacy daily demand, and of which our Great Exhibition while we write is displaying to its millions of visitors such magnificent specimens. The extraction of metals from their ores — the assaying of ores and metals — the special extraction of gold and silver — the arts of enameling on iron, of gilding and silvering, of photography, of pyrotechny, of bleaching, dyeing, and printing, of malting and distilling, of preserving timber, of making mortars and cements,

of obtaining gas from coal and other combustible materials, of preparing mixed metals,—and the many other non-mechanical arts, with which a visit to the workshops of our great manufacturing towns would probably make many of our readers for the first time acquainted,—all these possess, consult, and are more or less guided by their own chemical books, many of them by periodical journals, written specially to elucidate and explain their own processes.

Then, as a symptom of progress, the rise of the science in general estimation is most significant. It must have been remarked by every body whose attention has been drawn to the subject, that in our own island chemistry has assumed an entirely new position within the last five-and-twenty years. Five-and-twenty years ago, only three or four men held open schools for teaching its most difficult departments. Scarcely any young persons studied it as a branch of education but such as were destined for the medical profession; and these, for the most part, only very superficially. Now, at least thirty professors, scattered over the island, teach it systematically, and at least as many more instructed chemists obtain a living by superintending or giving advice on its numerous practical applications. And besides medical students, to whom all educated druggists must be added, thousands of other young men are attending annual and systematic courses; while all who study it are both better and deeper taught than formerly, and their knowledge more severely tested in public and private examinations.

It is true that our old universities and the newer colleges, which tread reverently in their footsteps, give as yet but little public instruction in this science and pay it little honour,—counting their non-medical students of it by threes and fives,—but the middle classes and the masses extensively learn it in other schools of less pretension both at home and abroad; and it is thus gradually leavening the people. While the old universities have delayed to supply the general wants, or to keep pace with the demands of our progressive material civilisation, numerous new colleges and schools have sprung up, partly general and partly special in their objects, to meet the views and wishes of the less stationary part of our population. In most of these new schools, chemistry occupies a prominent place as a branch of study; while, both in connexion with them and in many separate localities, laboratories have been erected in which the science is taught experimentally and analytically, and researches are undertaken into previously unexplored departments of nature.

Of the *rate* at which the science is now making way, a popular
VOL. XCIV. NO. CXC.

notion may be formed from the contents of one of the German books of which we have given the titles. The 'Handwörterbuch der reinen und angewandten Chemie' is a dictionary of pure and applied chemistry, which began to be issued a few years ago. It has now reached the beginning of the letter K, having completed only ten letters of the alphabet. Nevertheless, to bring up its accumulated arrears, a supplement of 440 pages has been issued, which is now only commencing the letter B. The supplement, in fact, contains nearly as much matter under the letter A as the body of the dictionary itself — so that two works are, in reality, proceeding *pari passu*, the one bringing up the arrears of the other, and promising, when complete, to fill as many volumes. This case illustrates not only the rapid rate at which chemical knowledge is advancing, but the special disadvantages also under which the students and teachers of progressive knowledge labour. The newest text-books are always behind the state of the science. If not already in arrear before they issue from the press, they are always greatly so before an edition of a treatise even of acknowledged merit can be sold off among a limited population like ours. Those who only read or teach from such books must, therefore, be behind also. Hence the necessity of purchasing new works almost monthly, in various tongues — of continued study in order to maintain a familiarity with the *status quo* of the science — of the regular perusal of journals, and of the personal prosecution of laboratory experiment and research.

The progress of chemistry during the present century is characteristically divided into two epochs. During the first thirty years the mineral or inorganic branch of the science received the principal attention of chemists; during the latter twenty, organic chemistry has been gradually attracting to itself the larger number of chemical investigators. It has, in consequence, advanced not only in general estimation, but also in actual extent and in positive importance, in a proportionate degree. In the history of the inorganic period, the names of Davy, Dalton, Wollaston, Prout, Thomson, and Berzelius — all but one now numbered with the dead — occupy a prominent place. But the long career and many labours of Berzelius connect him more than any other of his contemporaries with the successive leading steps in this department from 1800 to 1848. A brief outline of his scientific life, therefore — a somewhat scanty justice having been done him in this country while he lived — besides being otherwise very instructive, will both lighten the graver matter of our pages, and will enable us to

present to the reader, in a somewhat connected and more readable form, the main consecutive advances of the science.

In the year 1778, Sweden lost the illustrious Linnæus, but in the August of the year following the loss was replaced by the birth of Berzelius. Early an orphan, he was for some years under the care of a stepfather, a pious Swedish clergyman, with whom 'he read a chapter of the Bible every morning, 'and one of "Sturm's Reflections" every afternoon,' preparatory to his daily walk. In the course of one of these walks, it is related, that, struck with his eagerness in collecting plants, and with the acuteness of his observations, his stepfather remarked, 'Jacob, thou hast talent enough to walk in the footsteps either of Linnæus or Cartouche, — I hope thou hast 'God before thy eyes, and so wilt thou do the former.' Yet for some time he gave little prospect of the fulfilment of these hopes. Banded about from house to house, and brought up among connexions who looked upon him as a burden, his vigour, though unbroken, was long subdued. When his childhood was over, he spent four unprofitable years at the school of Norköping, and quitted it, along with some other young men, for the university of Upsala, in the autumn of 1796. But opposite to his name, in the list forwarded by the Rector of the school to the University authorities, were the words 'indifferent 'in behaviour and of doubtful hope.' He was received therefore, with reserve, and regarded with suspicion. His first year was passed idly; and, his small patrimony — originally 200 rix-dollars (17*l.*), and the ninth part of a small farm — being then exhausted, he engaged himself as tutor to a family in East Gothland. The necessity of teaching made him here somewhat improve himself, till, having obtained a stipendium (an exhibition or bursary) he returned to college in 1798. He now underwent what is called the Medico-philosophical Examen; and it is remarkable — considering the eminence he afterwards obtained in this line — that Afzelius, the Professor of Chemistry, was so dissatisfied with his answers, as to say to his brother professors, 'that he would not send the young man back if *they* 'were satisfied with him.' He was not absolutely turned back, therefore, but his second examination was postponed for a year. It was possibly this partial disgrace, which at length aroused him to exertion; and the objections of Afzelius may have turned his special attention to Chemistry. He was nineteen years of age; and he began to frequent the laboratory of the professor, then, as now, in the continental universities, open to the students. But his evil name accompanied him thither. On one of his first visits he was encountered by the question,

'if he understood the difference between a laboratory and a kitchen?' and, finally, the treatment of Ekeberg, the laborator, drove him from it in disgust. Meanwhile he studied assiduously at his lodgings, without counsel or advice. War was now raging between phlogiston and oxygen. The teachers adhered to the old faith — the despised pupil took up the new, and succeeded, in his own apartments, in preparing oxygen gas, and showing the combustion of various substances in it to his fellow-students, although in the laboratory, for a whole year, the attempt had been made in vain. In our own days of experimental dexterity, what a picture does this present of the condition of laboratories and of the skill of laborators in the year 1800! And how much does the following incident teach us!

One afternoon, on entering the laboratory, a glass retort caught his eye, which the professor had unwillingly taken from his closet in the morning, for some necessary experiment, with many injunctions to carefulness and a safe return. For a glass retort Berzelius had long been wishing, with a view to an experiment he desired to perform at home. Snatching at the unexpected good luck, with an absence of scruple such as keen collectors often display, he carried home the prize, and there, in the silence and solitude of night, observed the phenomenon he longed to see, and by which he was led to his first chemical discovery. The searching spirit which many years before had struck his step-father in the child, had begun again to animate the young man. With the stolen retort he not only increased his own knowledge, but added also to that of mankind at large. Though as yet scarcely looked upon as a student, he was already on the highway of discovery; and though years of difficulty and struggle afterwards beset the man, this keen spirit never once forsook him — it increased only in energy as the obstacles increased with which he had to contend. The summer of 1799 was spent by him in an apothecary's shop in Wadstena, where, from an Italian, he learned the art of working in glass: his after dexterity in an art now so indispensable in the laboratory, will be long remembered by all his pupils. Having passed the winter in Upsala, he was employed during the ensuing summer as assistant to a physician at the mineral waters of Medevi. These waters he analysed, and made them the subject of his thesis at his second examen, in December, 1800. But, now again, Afzelius opposed him at his examination. He had no confidence, he said, in the analyses of the young man; and, finally, he recommended him 'to go to the University of Lund, where he might possibly have better luck.' The difficulties, however, were at last got over, and he was allowed to pass.

Meanwhile he had made researches on the production of nitric ether, on the properties of nitrous oxide, and other subjects then little understood. These he placed in the hands of Afzelius, by whom they were sent to the Academy of Sciences at Stockholm. After three years the secretary of that learned body returned them with the brief remark, 'that they did not acknowledge 'the new nomenclature!'

Here then we seem to stand on the very threshold of modern chemistry. Phlogiston was not yet abandoned by that very scientific academy, which, at a subsequent period, for nearly thirty years, led the van in chemical views and nomenclature.

The discovery of Volta, in 1800, had excited Berzelius to make experiments with the new pile on the human body; these formed the subject of his dissertation at his licentiate's examen in 1802. The following year he settled in Stockholm, and was appointed Adjunct Professor of Medicine and Pharmacy in the College of Medicine. In 1804 he took his Doctor's Degree, eight years after leaving Norköping; but it was not till 1807 that he was appointed actual Professor in the School of Medicine of Stockholm, an office which he held for nearly forty years. Still the Academy—whose proceedings he afterwards directed for so many years—refused to publish his papers; less generous minds could see no genius in one whom an unfavourable reputation had followed from school and from university. He associated himself, therefore, with his friend Hisinger in the publication of the '*Afhandlingar i fysik, Kemi och Mineralogie.*' which subsequently attained so much celebrity. His perseverance finally triumphed. In 1808 he was elected a member of the Academy; in 1810 acted as its president; in 1813 a yearly pension was assigned him, as had formerly been done to Scheele, on condition 'that he should communicate to the 'Academy the researches they had formerly despised;' and, finally, in 1818, during his absence in Paris, he was elected Perpetual Secretary. This appointment placed him at the head of the science of his native country; and the pecuniary and other difficulties under which he had hitherto laboured were, at the same time, in a great measure removed.

The early life of Berzelius was thus a constant struggle with poverty, with unkindness, and with many difficulties, which had originated in an idle, listless, and unconciliatory disposition, itself the fruit of a depressed and half-broken spirit. How different the opinion formed of him by his teachers from that which his pupils and friends universally entertained in after life. The mental discipline he underwent at college probably, however, improved him as a man; and, had he not thus been almost forced

into the study of experimental science, to which his mind seemed early and naturally predisposed, he might have passed a life of little comfort to himself, and of no value to his country. •

It is from 1803 that the researches of the Swedish chemist link themselves with all the main steps in the progress of the chemistry of the present century. The era of modern chemistry may be said to have dawned when the oxygen of Lavoisier began to get the better of the phlogiston of Stahl, and the balance to be recognised as an indispensable instrument of research. It fairly commenced when the discoveries of Volta and Galvani not only made men acquainted with a new power which evidently influenced the chemical relations of bodies, but put in the hands of the experimenter a new and most effective instrument of investigation. In the successful hands of Davy this instrument soon after led to the most felicitous results. In 1803 Berzelius published a paper on the decomposition of saline compounds by galvanism; five years later Davy, by the same agent, decomposed the alcalies; and, while the world was ringing with this latter discovery, 'I succeeded,' says the Swedish Philosopher, 'in going a step further; and, by the aid of quicksilver, decomposed the alkaline earths and ammonia, of which I informed Davy, who acknowledged, in his reply, that this reduction was previously unknown to him.' Thus within twenty years were two revolutions made in chemical knowledge and theory, and each by the use of a new tool. The balance established the views of Lavoisier, the galvanic battery wrought the discoveries of Davy.

These discoveries were the foundation of the Electro-Chemical theory, and became intimately connected also with what is called the Atomic theory, or the doctrine of definite, equivalent, and multiple proportions. The study of the mutual and relative influences and re-actions of atoms or molecules, insensible in size, and acting at insensible distances,—of the laws by which these are regulated or determined,—of the sensible effects which accompany, or follow, from the mutual combinations and disjunctions of these molecules,—and of the modifications which circumstances or agents, under or beyond our control, impose upon the manifestation of these laws, and upon their results;—forms, in reality, a large part of the whole field of chemical inquiry. Its deepest doctrines and researches are entirely molecular, and the pure science has become a refined department of physics. The foundation of the Atomic theory was laid by the researches of Wenzel and Richter, in Germany; but this theory was first made the basis of a new system of Chemical Philosophy by our English Dalton. To the latter, and to Dr. Prout, as

speculative philosophers, it owes much; and very much also, to the experimental researches of Wollaston and Thomson. But the analytical labours of Berzelius, which were devoted for so many years to the determination of what are called Atomic weights or combining proportionals, and the investigations of Gay Lussac on the combining volumes of gases and vapours, contributed more to the rational establishment of this new system than those of any other individual chemists. Many co-operated, however, in different degrees; and a valuable sketch of its progress, and of the shares of the several fellow-labourers, will be found in an able treatise 'On the Atomic Theory,' by Dr. Daubeny, of which a second edition has recently appeared from the Oxford press.

The multiplied analytical researches of Berzelius may be said to have given rise also to the now most recondite and difficult department of analytical chemistry. The knowledge bearing upon the inorganic,—so refined and abstruse a portion of this department,—has been extended and enlarged by several of his pupils, and especially by Professor Heinrich Rose, of Berlin. It might have been supposed to have been digested and matured in the 'Ausführliches Handbuch der Analytischen Chemie' of this distinguished analyst. For Professor Rose's 'Manual' is a book of 2000 octavo pages; and yet, like nearly all our chemical books, it was already behind the time before the last sheet issued from the press.

These analyses led successively to the discovery in Sweden, and elsewhere, of many new elementary bodies. By a simple or elementary body chemists mean one which is incapable by any known methods of being resolved into two or more other bodies differing from itself. Compound bodies again consist of, and can by known means be resolved into, two or more elements regarded as simple. Of such elementary bodies only twenty-nine were known at the beginning of the present century; we are now acquainted with sixty-three. This fact will illustrate to the general reader one great feature in the progress of modern chemistry. But to the chemist the discovery of thirty-four new elementary bodies implies an amount of painful research,—preceding and following each discovery,—of which words can convey to the uninitiated no adequate idea.

It is not merely that the satisfactory isolation of a new element is itself a work of long and discriminating labour, or that it imposes almost endless after-inquiries concerning its relations and combinations with other bodies; but such a discovery casts a doubt upon all past analyses of a particular class, and renders imperative a repetition of many most serious investiga-

tions. The way in which each analytical discovery thus throws us back, as it were, will appear by a simple illustration. It was early discovered that the mineral matter of plants contained silica—the substance of flint—in considerable quantity. Yet, this substance was supposed to form no part of the bodies of animals, and to be a characteristic feature of the vegetable kingdom, till an analysis of the feathers of birds proved that they too contained silica in a very sensible proportion. It was sought for, therefore, in the natural covering,—the hair of animals and man; and new analyses proved it to be present there also. But if in the hair it must be in the blood, from which all the parts of the body are formed and draw their constant support. Renewed examinations of the blood, accordingly, discovered it there, and thus new light was thrown upon animal physiology, and upon the natural relations between plants and animals.

So also in nearly all our analyses of the ashes of plants and of the parts of animals, common salt had been found in comparatively small proportion. But recent research, conducted after improved methods, has shown that some at least of these ashes contain this substance in much larger proportion than was previously believed; they, therefore, suggest the necessity of repeating all our experiments in this field before the true composition of the inorganic part of living beings can be said to be ascertained. Iodine, in like manner, early found in marine plants, has recently been detected in the common cress, and in many other plants which grow in fresh water. Must we not expect to find it in all plants? Is its presence not necessary to the healthy sustenance of animals? Fluorine exists in sea-water and in marine plants. But it exists also in the bones and teeth of all animals, in milk and in blood. It must therefore be present in all vegetable food, and must be necessary to the healthy growth both of plants and animals. In the past analyses, however, of the mineral matter of the plants on which we live, it has neither been sought for nor detected. The same imperfect process of preparing the ash of plants and animals, which has caused a portion of the common salt to disappear, has probably also lessened the true amount both of iodine and of fluorine in the specimens hitherto analysed. Even bromine may possibly not be absent from plants and animals, if carefully sought for. Those who are aware of the amount of analytical labour which during the last ten years has been expended upon this branch of analysis, chiefly for the benefit of agriculture and physiology, will be able to estimate the nature of the task which awaits the chemist, by whom it must all be repeated. In this way new discoveries in chemistry are continually harking us back. Old analyses in the inorganic kingdom,

though useful to a certain extent, all become from time to time un-trustworthy, and the labours of years must be gone over again. But this is only the periodical retiring of the monthly wave, which at the next spring-tide may assert a wider and more secure dominion than it ever possessed before.

It is in connexion with mineralogy that the inorganic chemistry of our time finds one of its most indisputable triumphs, the atomic theory one of its most interesting applications, and chemical analysis the field of its most arduous and constantly renewing tasks. Born in a country rich in minerals, and abounding in mineral wealth, Berzelius and most of his chemical pupils and successors in Sweden have dedicated much of their attention to the productions of the mineral kingdom. Before him Klaproth and others had analysed many of these substances, without knowing or even thinking of any general principle, by which either the results of their analyses might be tested, or the minerals themselves classified and arranged.

It was after his visit to England in 1812 that Berzelius threw into a methodical form the results of his numerous mineral analyses, and applied to them the new views in respect to the electro-chemical relations of bodies, and the proportions in which they combine with each other. In 1814 the Swedish edition of his 'Application of Chemical Proportions to Mineralogy' was published. Within a few years it was known and reprinted in most European languages. Its illustrations were subsequently from time to time augmented, and the principles on which it was based more firmly fixed, by numerous fresh analyses executed by himself and others. The most complete form in which his latest views have yet appeared is in the 'Berzelius's 'Neues Chemisches Mineral System' of Professor Rammelsberg of Berlin, published in 1847; while the book which at present most fully represents the actual condition of chemical mineralogy is the 'Handwörterbuch der Chemischen Theils der 'Mineralogie' of the same author, with its four several supplements.*

To those who are capable of contrasting the old mineralogy with the new, the happy conclusions, which the numerous analytical labours of Berzelius and his pupils have successively attained in this branch of science, appear very striking. What

* This work presents another instance of the rapidity of chemical progress. It was published in Berlin in 1841, and contains 768 pages. The last of the four supplements appeared in 1849, and they contain in all 762 pages. The new matter of the last eight years is equal in bulk to all that was known before!

was formerly an undigested collection of rude stones, brought together according to no natural law, and arranged only according to weight, colour, hardness, or form, more or less imperfectly determined, analytical chemistry has classified into families and groups, beautifully scientific, and characterised by singular analogies in form and composition. It has established close relations among individuals and classes, such as could not previously be even suspected to exist. It has afforded to the philosophical generaliser the means of testing the correctness of analyses, of determining what is essential or otherwise to the composition of a mineral, and of thus assigning to it its proper place in his groups and system. And re-acting, as all such special investigations do, upon pure chemistry, the development of this branch — uniting in itself the joint investigation of composition and of crystalline form — has made known the existence of analogies and relations among long familiar elementary bodies, of which the study of merely artificial combinations had previously given us no intimation. It has been recognised, in short, that the interior of the earth is nature's laboratory, in which she is continually carrying on an endless variety of chemical operations, the results of which, like those which are obtained in our own laboratories, belong altogether to the domain, and are subjected to the recognised laws, of chemical science. Mineralogy, in so far as it is not purely physical, is, in fact, only a subordinate branch of inorganic chemistry. Pure minerals must be arranged, like all other pure chemical combinations, and like them are capable of being represented by definite literal formulæ.

No one who has not himself been for some time occupied with mineral analysis can have any idea of the world of time and labour which has been spent in the analytical investigation of mineral compounds. Among the thousands of specimens which adorn our cabinets, one beautiful group, long distinguished by the name of zeolites — hydrated silicates of alumina, with lime, potash, and soda, chemists now call them — is well known to mineralogists. The drawers now before us contain about fifty species belonging to this group. We take up at random a specimen of Laumonite, named from its discoverer, Gillet de Laumont. This mineral has been analysed successively by Vogel, Gmelin, Dufrenoy, Connel, Von Babo, Delffs, Domeyko, Malaguti, and Durocher. Nine analytical chemists have each, at successive periods, with a knowledge of the labours of their predecessors, devoted some weeks to the examination of this one stone; and yet its chemical formula and most natural relations are still open to question. On a moderate calculation,

an amount of chemical activity equal to that of four long and laborious analytical lives, has been expended in elucidating the composition of these zeolitic minerals alone. How long must it be before a reasonable man can expect chemical mineralogy to arrive at its final settlement!

Our space admits only of an allusion to the beautiful researches into the relation of chemical composition to crystalline form in natural and artificial compounds, which have given Mitscherlich a distinguished place in the conjoined history of chemistry and mineralogy. Isomorphism, Dimorphism, Isodimorphism, and the doctrine of Replacement, are all subjects suggestive to any one well read in the history of chemical progress, of many successive labours; of memoirs and experiments full of beauty; and of numerous partial but gradually widening generalisations. But in this branch, as in the direct analyses of our zeolitic minerals, a single page of a 'systematic treatise' comprehends often the results of whole lives of thought and toil. The young student, as he masters the page before him, acquires the knowledge of grey-haired philosophers in the maturity of their fame and fortune. Yet he can never look upon his learning with the interest which those men feel who are familiar with the difficult passages and hard struggles through which the fame has been achieved, or the knowledge arrived at, which the page embodies.

Before quitting this topic, however, we must spare a few words for that subtle, almost microscopic, branch of qualitative analysis, where the blowpipe is made an instrument of research in mineralogy and inorganic chemistry. To Berzelius the world owes the first treatise which brought the blowpipe into general use among chemists. His volume '*On the Use of the Blowpipe in Chemistry and Mineralogy*'* appeared in Swedish in 1820, and contained the results of many years' experience of his own, added to the earlier knowledge he had acquired from the personal instructions of Gahn. Among the men of whom Berzelius always retained an affectionate and grateful remembrance, was Assessor Gottlieb Gahn. Already advanced in years, but full of the mineralogical knowledge of his time, and skilled above every other Swede in the employment of the blowpipe in chemical inquiry, he encouraged by his kindly notice and sympathy the rising chemist, while still struggling with early difficulties. He communicated to him, also, all the

* *Om Blåsrörets Användande i Kemien och Mineralogien.* Stockholm, 1820. It was translated into German, French, English, Italian, and Russian.

practical skill which the Swedish assayers, from before the time when Stahl used the blowpipe in 1700, had been gradually accumulating, and of which Bergman, with the assistance of Gahn, then his pupil, had already published a synopsis in the second volume of his 'Chemical Essays.*' The filial spirit of a grateful scholar appeared in what we have heard Berzelius say, long after Gahn's death, about his own book on the blowpipe: 'Most of what I have recorded there I learned from Gahn; I have only put it into my own words.' Of late years this branch of inquiry has also received great extension; and the work of Plattner ('Die Probirkunst mit dem Löthrohr'), which has been done into English by Dr. Muspratt, is now a standard authority.

Within the domain of inorganic chemistry, yet another field of vast extent is now undergoing the operation of clearing. To speak in the language of a North American settler, the trees are partially cut down; a few have already been burned; the first seed has been sown upon the spread ashes; and the green blade is beginning to cover with verdure the primeval soil. To Geology, the twin sister of Mineralogy, but of wider grasp by far and of loftier mind, Chemistry has for many years been offering her occasional aid. But the rough blockers-out of the young science were not prepared by their knowledge or pursuits to appreciate the nature and causes of by far the largest class of the manifold phenomena which the crust of our earth exhibits.

The daring mind of Davy made the first bold application of chemical knowledge to the explanation of the most impressive physico-geological phenomena which the surface of the globe now exhibits. The metal potassium, one of his great discoveries, takes fire on contact with cold water, produces much heat, and liberates a large volume of elastic (hydrogen) gas. This property of his new metal carried the philosopher's mind at once to the burning volcano and the shattering earthquake. 'Give me,' he said, 'accumulations of potassium or sodium, or other analogous metals in the bowels of the earth, and let the waters of the sea descend to them, and all the phenomena of the volcano and of the earthquake may be produced.' There is no impossibility—scarcely an improbability, as he afterwards believed—that masses of these metals should here and there exist in the interior of the earth. And it was to him an interesting fact, that nearly all the active volcanoes then known were situated near the sea; from which,

* The English Translation of this work was published in London—the first and second volumes in 1788, and the third in 1791.

therefore, water might readily descend to such accumulations of his combustible metals. 'They are the cause of earthquakes and volcanoes,' was the conclusion, therefore, of his rapid and ardent mind; and thus he became the author and propounder of what was called the 'Chemical Theory of Volcanoes.' This theory, possessing both simplicity and beauty, was readily adopted by numerous philosophers. And, although the progress of knowledge has now greatly lessened the degree of special favour with which it used to be regarded even by inquirers after truth, yet many of Davy's old disciples still cling to it as the true doctrine of nature, and refuse materially to modify their early faith. Among English authors, this view is still upheld in the work of Dr. Daubeny*,—on other accounts a very valuable book; while a partial collection, especially of the physical facts, which are to aid future chemico-geologists in arriving at a general theory of both earthquakes and volcanoes, has been admirably commenced by Mr. Mallet of Dublin†, under the auspices, and in the published transactions, of the British Association for the Advancement of Science.

But from every field or section of geological investigation, numerous chemical questions spring up. With igneous rocks, whether more ancient or more modern—with the so-called metamorphic or altered rocks, the origin, original nature and changes of each, and with the origin and relations of the numerous mineral substances they respectively contain—countless inquiries are connected which this science is called upon to answer. The slow changes to which deposits of gypsum, of rock-salt, of natron, and of nitrate of soda are due, demand for their elucidation profound chemical study. Coal and the combustible minerals, the mysterious amber and the precious diamond,—their origin, the successive changes through which their first material passed before it assumed its final form, and what were the special circumstances by which these changes were induced, promoted, retarded, or arrested,—veins filled with metalliferous minerals, or with sparry contents of various kinds; stratified deposits and veins of phosphate of lime; mineral waters,—the nature, source, and constancy of their impregnations; pure water and steam,—their agency under ordinary and extraordinary temperatures and pressures, in altering rocks and producing specific mineral combinations; the atmosphere,—its

* Description of Active and Extinct Volcanoes. Second Edition, 8vo. London: 1848.

† First Report on the Facts of Earthquake Phenomena. By Robert Mallet, M.R.I.A. London: 1850.

past and present constitution and history, its influence on the materials which form the earth's crust, and their influence again in modifying its composition; the changes which the remains of organised beings buried in the strata induce, or have themselves undergone during the prolonged action of natural causes,—these make, severally, almost unlimited demands on the patience and sagacity of chemists, which the labours of many coming years will be unable fully to satisfy. Chemical geology will by and by be recognised as a department of geological science at least as distinct and valuable as the hitherto more popular and more generally interesting branch of Paleontology; and, as demanding a special knowledge in its cultivators at least equally extensive and profound. It will continue also to grow in interest and freshness long after the early zeal in behalf of mere descriptive geology and the geography of rocks has died away. Since the time of Davy, numerous, though less ambitious, contributions to chemical geology have been made by Berzelius, Bonsdorff, Mitscherlich, Blum, Delesse, Deville, Ebelmen, and other chemical analysts and observers. Among the latter, Professor Bischoff of Bonn has of late years taken a prominent place. And he is at present rendering an important service to this branch of the science, by embodying, along with his own peculiar views and private experiments, a learned critique upon nearly all that has been done by others in a voluminous work,—‘*Lehrbuch der Chemischen und Physicalischen Geologie*,’—now issuing from the press, and of which the concluding part is promised during the present year.

Lying between the two great divisions of mineral and organic chemistry, and belonging almost equally to both, are the interesting subjects of Allotropism, Isomerism, Polymerism, Catalysis, and some others, to which recent investigations have called the attention of philosophical chemists, and which tend daily to connect the familiar and sensible phenomena of the science with the most recondite considerations of molecular philosophy. But over these topics we most unwillingly pass, that we may devote a larger space to the already wide and rapidly growing department of organic chemistry.

That this department *should* be large, will be admitted by the reader when he learns that it embraces the study of every part of every thing which lives or which has lived, and of countless compound bodies which are formed during the decay or artificial decomposition of the several parts of living things, animal or vegetable. Not only are the parts and products of

each plant and animal very numerous, as well as the successive changes they undergo in the successive stages of their growth, and during various forms of disease, but each of the many thousands of living species in both kingdoms produces or contains some thing peculiar to itself, which chemistry must examine. Can any limit be assigned to a field so wide as this? During late years, the name of Liebig has been most prominently connected with the progress of organic chemistry. As, however, his career did not begin till the foundations of this line of inquiry had been already laid, we must commence our sketch at an earlier period.

The Alchemists had done little here. *Their* experimental trials were made for the most part upon mineral substances, although after the process of distillation came to be perfected, alcohol and some ethereal oils were discovered by them; succinic acid was obtained from amber; benzoic acid from gum benzoin; and vinegar and wood spirit from the dry distillation of wood. But it was not till towards the close of the phlogistic period that organic chemistry, in the hands of Bergman and Scheele, began to make any decided progress; nor till a still later period that it first received from Lavoisier a decidedly scientific character. Lavoisier applied to organic compounds the same method of interrogation by which he had effected his great reforms in inorganic chemistry. Of what elementary bodies does this organic compound consist?—of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen, experiment answered. Then in what proportions by weight do they severally exist in it? Thus the use of the balance and the accuracy of numbers found their way also into this department of the science.

Two things now became necessary to future progress,—to devise a set of methods by which organic compounds might be obtained in a pure state, possessing constant properties and composition; and a second set, by which their elementary constituents might be separated from each other, so completely and in such a form, as to admit of being respectively weighed and measured with the necessary degree of accuracy. The latter of these objects was only imperfectly attained by Lavoisier himself, and subsequently by Fourcroy, Vauquelin (1802) and de Saussure (1807). It was more completely arrived at through the processes introduced by Gay Lussac and Thenard (1810), and those recommended by Dr. Prout, and was virtually perfected through those employed by Berzelius in the analyses which he published in 1814. It is an important point in the history of analytical chemistry, to remark that, to the methods adopted in the year 1815, scarcely any thing has since been

added by which greater accuracy can be secured. The introduction of Liebig's beautiful tube, and the successive valuable suggestions and processes of Dumas and others, have greatly simplified, and rendered more generally attainable, the rapid and facile performance of organic analyses; but they have added little to the accuracy of the results which a careful analyst could already arrive at by the methods of 1815. Of this truth we present the following illustration.

Among the substances of which Berzelius had published analyses in 1814, were benzoic acid and benzoate of lead. It was our good fortune, subsequently, to be his guest in Stockholm in 1832, when he received from Liebig, by letter, an account of the most interesting researches of himself and Wöhler, into the nature of the oil of bitter almonds, and its kindred compounds. In this letter a doubt was expressed respecting the true formula for benzoic acid as deduced from the analyses published by Berzelius in 1814. We had, in consequence, the pleasure of witnessing a re-preparation, with his own hands, of the benzoate of lead, and a re-analysis of the acid it contained. The percentage results of these new trials were found, on turning back to the old note-book, to agree to the third place of decimals, with the numbers obtained for the composition of benzoic acid, twenty years before! The reader will not wonder that such a circumstance should have inspired us with great faith in the precision of the early as well as later methods and researches of this distinguished chemist.

Among the successive steps of more or less importance, in the progress which this branch of the science began to make, after accurate methods of analysis had been discovered, that of Chevreul proved particularly effective. In his great work upon the fats*, he showed the use of studying and analysing, not only the natural substances or compounds themselves, but the chemical changes also which they may undergo; and the new products and compounds they can be made to yield. And further, by comparing the composition as well of these products as of their combinations with other substances, with that of the natural bodies from which they were derived, he illustrated how one analysis might be made to control and test the accuracy of another; how, in this manner, most interesting views might be arrived at, in regard to the molecular constitution of organic compounds, and how, what had been hitherto very obscure chemical changes, might be lucidly explained. From him,

* *Recherches Chimiques sur les Corps gras d'Origine Animale.* Par M. E. Chevreul. Paris: 1823.

therefore, must be dated the first outline of a true analytical investigation of an organic compound.

The subsequent pursuit of this method of inquiry brought into more general use the habit of representing by formulæ what is called the *rational* constitution of a body. The results of analysis show the numerical proportions in which the several elementary bodies or their equivalents exist in the compounds examined, and enable chemists to represent their composition by formulæ, which are absolutely true as expressions of these results. In the simple case of oxalic acid, for example, analysis shows with certainty that its two constituents, carbon and oxygen, are present in it, in the proportion of two equivalents of the former (C_2) to three of the latter (O_3), and that it may, therefore, be truly represented by $C_2 O_3$. But whether the three molecules or atoms of oxygen are united directly with the two of carbon, as may be represented by $(2 C + 3 O)$; or whether they are so arranged that two of carbon being united to two of oxygen ($C_2 O_2$), this compound is united again with the third atom of oxygen as in $(C_2 O_2 + O)$; or whether two of a compound $C O$ are united with this third of oxygen, as in $(2 C O + O)$; or whether finally, the well known gas, carbonic acid $C O_2$, unites directly with the equally well known carbonic oxide $C O$, so as to form oxalic acid, then truly represented by $(C O_2 + C O)$;—these molecular or theoretical questions are not at all touched upon by the *empirical* formula $C_2 O_3$, though that formula is absolutely true as a representation of the relative proportions, determined by accurate analyses, in which its constituents exist in oxalic acid.

The principle involved in the above illustration has, ever since 1814, occupied more or less of the attention of organic chemists. It has given occasion, at different periods, to violent controversies, often foolishly warm, and in the conduct of which a philosophical zeal for the truth has occasionally been overborne by individual feelings, and even by the spirit of national rivalry. But, although very different theoretical views have been successively taken, as knowledge advanced, by different chemists, in regard to the rational composition of sundry organic compounds, yet these very differences have promoted, in almost every instance, the advancement of the science. They have each suggested additional inquiries, and indicated the necessity of new and special analytical investigations; so that rational formulæ, embodying, as they often do, most valuable hypotheses or conjectures, have in reality become an element of further progress. And now it is regarded as a requisite, very desirable if not indispensable, in the formulæ for organic substances,

that they should express, not only the relative proportions of the elements of which the substances consist, but a probable grouping of the molecules also, by which their relations to other substances of analogous composition, and their principal chemical reactions may be suggested or explained. In more Southern Europe, Dumas, Boullay, Laurent, and Gerhardt have been most conspicuous in this division of chemical labour.

In 1814, Berzelius, in his published analyses, showed that the doctrine of chemical equivalents was applicable to organic as well as to inorganic compounds; and thus by the aid of symbols, in which each elementary substance was represented by the initial letter of its Latin name, he was enabled to construct formulæ, by which, as we have said, their composition, as determined by analyses, could be truly represented. But his view then was, and many followed him in adopting it, that in organic substances consisting of three elements — carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen — the constituents were united with each other directly into *ternary* combinations, such as may be understood by placing the molecules in this manner $\overset{C}{HO}$, instead of being first united by twos, as would be represented by such formulæ as $CH + O$ or $C + HO$. In this ternary mode of union he recognised also a clear and satisfactory distinction between organic compounds, and those of the inorganic kingdom in which only binary combinations had hitherto been recognised. Already, however, in 1819, when he published the great contribution to scientific mineralogy, of which we have already spoken, Berzelius intimated his belief that the electro-chemical theory was also capable of best explaining all the phenomena exhibited by organic bodies. This involved the opinion that organic compounds were all binary, and he now began to represent the organic acids as oxides of what are now well known in chemistry by the name of compound radicals.

These so-called radicals of Berzelius were for the most part hypothetical, only supposed or assumed to exist. It was to the brilliant researches of Gay Lussac, that we owed our first acquaintance with a compound body which exhibited all the chemical relations hitherto supposed to be characteristic of the elementary substances. His discovery of cyanogen, — a compound of nitrogen and carbon, which behaved in every respect towards the elementary bodies as chlorine and iodine do, — at once astonished and enlightened the chemists of the time (1815), and was doubtless the germ of the new views soon after adopted by Berzelius (1819) and others, in reference to organic com-

binations. This was probably hastened also by the idea thrown out by Ampere, in 1816, that, as the compound cyanogen was analogous to the electro-negative elements, chlorine, iodine, &c., so the hypothetical compound *ammonium*, consisting of nitrogen and hydrogen (NH_4), resembled in all its chemical relations the large family of metals, or electro-positive elementary bodies. But cyanogen and the supposed ammonium contained *two* elementary bodies only; and although much progress was made in rational organic chemistry by the aid of these additions to our knowledge, yet much darkness and doubt existed still. In decomposing organic substances it had often been remarked that certain elements or certain proportions of their constituent elements, were separated from a compound more easily than others, and thus appeared to be held by a less powerful affinity, or to form less necessary portions of the molecular arrangement as a whole. Did the more firmly united molecules — often containing three elements — constitute a central radical, round which the others were grouped more loosely, from which the latter might be removed without breaking up the central arrangement, or with which, instead of the latter, other elements might be combined, without altogether taking away the characteristic properties of the compound into which they were introduced? Experience could not answer this question.

Years of active thought and research scarcely yet appeared to justify the supposition that radicals containing three elements really did exist. It was pushing theory much too far a-head of experiment, — leaping too far into the unknown, — to admit that radicals might exist of which oxygen, united to hydrogen and carbon, formed a part, and which should yet appear in their relations to chlorine, and the other elementary bodies, as if they were themselves simple and uncompounded. But the dawn of a new day had come, and a gleam of fresh light was thrown upon rational organic chemistry, when in 1832, a memoir on the composition and properties of benzoyl appeared, the joint production of Liebig and Wöhler. We can well recollect the surprise and pleasure expressed to ourselves by Berzelius on the perusal of the first account of their experiments; and every one at all acquainted with the later history of this branch of the science, must be aware, how much the results of these experiments have contributed to promote its rapid advancement. Since that period, indeed, Liebig has been gradually acquiring in Northern Europe, in reference to organic chemistry, a position approaching to that so long occupied by Berzelius, in reference to the science as a whole.

But the growing vastness of chemical knowledge forbids the idea of any second Berzelius ever appearing*, distinguished at once by special contributions to every branch, and by an intimate acquaintance, practical and theoretical, with the entire range of chemistry, mineral and organic. Future great chemists must be content to bear rule each in his own particular walk only.

It would weary our readers were we to indulge in further detail regarding the progress of organic chemistry in its pure state. That the so-called rational views on the composition of organic bodies have undergone serious alterations at brief intervals of time, and as knowledge widened, is a proof that our progress has been rapid. And again, the extent to which such changes have really taken place, is popularly shown by the successive new names which have in consequence been imposed on the same substance, and the burdensome synonymy which has thus been introduced into the science. We open at random a volume of the German Dictionary of Chemistry, to which we have already referred, and the following synonymy appears at the head of the first paragraph which catches our eye. 'Hydrochlorate of Chloride of Vinyl, — Chloride of Elayl (Berzelius), — Hydrochlorate of Chloride of Acetyl (Liebig), — Chloride of Etherin (Mitscherlich), — Hydrochlorate of Chloride of Aldehydene (Regnault), — Chloride of Hydrocarbon, — Chloric Ether, — Oil of Olefiant Gas, — Oil of the Dutch chemists, — Dutch liquid.' Ten ponderous names for a useless oily liquid, discovered by some Dutch chemists in 1795, and which is produced when olefiant gas and chlorine-gas are mixed together! Probably as many more may be

* This difficulty of now mastering the science as *he* had been able to do, is put forward by Berzelius, in his *Årsberättelse* as far back as 1838 — of course with a very different view from ours. 'The period of my life,' he says, 'has been peculiarly favourable for the study of that science to which I have felt a natural inclination, and a similar one can never return. At the beginning of my scientific studies, new-born chemistry had scarcely left its cradle. The measure of existing knowledge did not exceed the capacity of youth to bear in mind. The whole was soon made familiar, though year by year it has been developed, and the measure of knowledge gradually increased. After forty years of progress, a mass of materials lies before the beginner of which it is impossible for him to make more than a part his own, within the period assigned to ordinary studies, and perhaps more than any one can ever altogether master, although it has not been difficult to become gradually possessed of all during a continued study of forty years.' Thirteen years of most rapid advance have elapsed since this was written, — how much more arduous, then, must the task be now!

given to it, before either its name is finally fixed, or its nature and rational formula truly determined. As marks of progress, real or imaginary, such a series of landmarks may be very interesting; but what human memory can hope to retain them all? With the view of simplifying, harmonising, and rendering uniform, the entire nomenclature of this organic department, Leopold Gmelin, in the fourth and fifth volumes of his most learned and most valuable '*Handbuch der Chemie*,' has boldly coined an entirely new system of names which are intended to supersede all that had gone before. Regnault also, in the fourth volume of his excellent '*Cours Élémentaire de Chimie*,' has introduced some beautiful theoretical simplifications into the nomenclature of certain classes of bodies which had been suggested by Dumas and others. Both attempts are entitled to great credit, more especially the laboriously developed and long digested scheme of Gmelin. His new names have the advantage of being intelligible through the synonymes that accompany them, which is not the case with those of Regnault. But the period has not yet arrived for fixing this nomenclature; and in both cases, we fear that the premature attempt will have only ended generally in new additions to the uncouth crowd of names by which the members of this class of bodies were previously known.

Among the most recent advances which have been made since the general reception of the doctrine of organic radicals, we may mention, on the one hand, the theoretical exposition of the doctrine of types and of organic replacement so ably set forth by Dumas; and on the other, the practical isolation of many radicals long supposed to exist but not hitherto obtained in a separate state—the preparation, by artificial processes, of numerous organic compounds possessed of alkaline properties, (organic alcalies)—and the similar artificial preparation of compounds which are naturally produced in the animal and vegetable kingdoms. The two latter points are deserving of a brief illustration.

It was long believed that the compound bodies formed and found in the living organism, whether animal or vegetable—which compose their tissues, or are contained in the fluids that fill their vessels—were specially produced by the agency of the principle of life; that in this agency consisted the main distinction between mineral and organic compounds; and that the production of the latter was beyond the reach of human art, operating upon mere dead matter. This belief has been gradually undermined by the progress of discovery. As early as 1811 it was known that starch and woody fibre could

be transformed into sugar, and in 1822, that starch or sugar could be changed into the acid of ants (formic acid). But in 1828, the remarkable fact was established, that the characteristic animal substance, *urea*, could be artificially prepared from certain compounds of cyanogen. In later years the number of such substances previously supposed to be characteristic of living beings, which can be prepared by art, has been greatly augmented. A persuasion is, in consequence, by degrees diffusing itself, that what is called the power of life has no exclusive influence in compelling the elementary bodies to unite after any special manner, so as to produce combinations to which their ordinary affinities in fitting circumstances do not naturally dispose them. And many are of opinion also that, as our knowledge of the influence of circumstances over these natural affinities increases, we shall be able to imitate more and more closely, and in far more frequent instances, the combinations hitherto considered peculiar to living structures. This opinion derives countenance and strength from a consideration of the chemical history of what are called organic alkalies.

It was regarded among chemists as a matter of great scientific interest, when, in 1817, Serturner fully established the presence in opium of a compound body, *morphine*, possessing alkaline properties, the existence of which he had already announced in 1805. Still greater interest was excited, when, many years later, Liebig and Wöhler succeeded in preparing artificially certain compound organic substances of similar alkaline properties. Of such organic alkalies, we now know nearly a hundred, which exist in, or are obtained directly from, the parts or products of living animals and vegetables. This shows a very rapid extension in our knowledge of one class of natural compounds. But we can now reckon also seventy or eighty others which can be formed by art, and which are not known to occur in nature; while methods recently discovered by Wurtz, and especially by Hoffman, hold out the prospect of increasing almost indefinitely the number of this class of artificial organic alkalies. Now among organic alkalies there are some, such as morphine, quinine, &c., which are exceedingly valuable in medicine, and which are high in price and less abundant, because they can only be obtained as yet from vegetable productions which are of rare growth, or limited to special climatic regions. Among the most useful practical results, therefore, which we anticipate from our increased power in producing organic alkalies, is the discovery of methods by which

these very valuable medicines may be prepared artificially, in any quantity and in any country.

But all our artificial imitations of natural products actually obtained or soon expected are prepared from substances already organised — by the mere transformation, that is to say, of the parts and products of living beings. A greater triumph to which we look forward, is the power of putting together the single or dead elements, and of making them unite so as to produce compounds which with all our discoveries can as yet only be obtained through the agency, direct or indirect, of animal and vegetable life. The muscles of animals, and the fibre of wood, for example, consist of distinct and definite chemical compounds—fibrine and cellulose they are respectively called — which our art has not yet been able to imitate, and which many have supposed to require for their production the special agency of the principle of life. What we hope finally to attain, is the power of forming from their elements the chemical compounds or raw materials — in this instance the fibrine and the cellulose — of which the muscle and the wood are chiefly composed. Of the first steps in this new career we obtain a glimpse in the artificial production, still somewhat uncontrollable, of ammonia and cyanogen in our fires and furnaces.

When we accomplish this, probably the utmost limit to which our art can aspire, the special functions of the principle of life will appear to be restricted to the higher purposes of putting these materials together so as to form the tissues and parts of living structures, and of transporting them and building them in, just where they are required. It is as if we might hope to prepare all the varied materials for a great building, without the hope of ever superseding the intelligent architect who designs the intended construction, or the living hands which are to put the building materials together.

Yet from the power over matter, with which existing progress has already invested man, how wondrously interesting are the results and substances which he can produce at will. One of these substances takes fire, and glows brilliantly when simply exposed to the air — another starts into flame when it is touched with water or with ice — a third shines in the air with a paler and more lambent but almost perpetual light — and the smell of a fourth is too nauseous to be endured. One gas when diffused through the air, in absolutely inappreciable proportion, affects those who inhale it with violent catarrh — another, when inhaled, exhilarates with a happy but fleeting intoxication — a third, if breathed but once, suddenly arrests the current of life. A single drop of one fluid, if swallowed, will produce in-

stant death — of another, will set in motion the whole contents of the alimentary canal, — while the vapour of a third will produce speedy insensibility. One solid substance, if merely touched, will crumble to powder and change its colour — another by gentle friction will explode with a terrific detonation — while others again change by a single gleam of the brilliant sun, and produce the wonderful pictures of Talbot and Daguerre. Again, other substances are enriched with healing, balsamic and salutary virtues — assuaging, exhilarating, or strengthening at the experimenter's will — realising, in a somewhat different sense, the aspirations of the later alchemists after a universal medicine.

* And then how remarkable are the changes in the sensible properties of an organic compound, and in its relations to animal life, which are produced by a very small alteration in its chemical composition! It is sufficiently striking that the union of combustible hydrogen gas with fire-supporting oxygen should produce the fire-extinguishing fluid water, and that salutary common salt should contain, mollified and disguised by its combination with a metal, sixty per cent. by weight of suffocating chlorine. But these combinations, water and common salt, consist of equal atoms of each constituent, which may readily be supposed, by their union, greatly to modify the properties of one another. In organic compounds, however, containing many molecules united together, it is more surprising that the addition of a single molecule more, should often entirely alter their properties and relations to life. Benzoyl, for example, contains twenty-one atoms — fourteen of carbon, five of hydrogen, and two of oxygen ($C_{14}H_5O_2$), — and yet the addition of one of hydrogen to these twenty-one ($C_{14}H_5O_2 + H$) forms the high flavoured and poisonous oil of bitter almonds; or one of oxygen added in its stead ($C_{14}H_5O_2 + O$) forms the well known solid benzoic acid, to which our pastilles owe so much of their agreeable odour. In cinnamyle, again, there are present twenty-seven atoms, and yet one of hydrogen added to these ($C_{15}H_7O_2 + H$) forms oil of cinnamon, and one of oxygen ($C_{15}H_7O_2 + O$), a solid substance called cinnamic acid. How very incomprehensible to us as yet are all such molecular changes!

Nor are the revelations less interesting which the analytical examination of organic bodies has made, in reference to matters which concern our daily tastes and preferences. The bouquet of wine is due to the presence of a peculiar ether, of which the mode of making or preserving the wine more or less favours the production. The wine of the grape is distinguished by containing tartaric acid, that of the apple and the pear by the

presence, instead, of the often less pleasant or less wholesome lactic acid. The mineral matter of the flesh of animals contains much potash and phosphoric acid, but scarcely any soda, and only a small per-centage of oxide of iron; — that of milk contains, along with much potash and phosphoric acid, a considerable proportion of soda also, but still less iron than is found in flesh; — while that of blood contains only a small per-centage of potash and phosphoric acid, but nearly half its weight of common salt, and from seven to ten per cent. of oxide of iron. How very striking to the physiologist are such results as these, of which our books are full — how suggestive of applications to the arts, the wants, and the welfare of the whole human race!

Thus far we have spoken of organic chemistry only in its pure sense. But, like the inorganic department, it connects itself with other natural sciences, which are often considered independent, and in the promotion of some of them, it is assuming an influential and leading place. We have already alluded to the natural subdivision into vegetable and animal chemistry, to which the abundance of its materials has given rise. But besides this, its applications to medicine fill a large space in our pharmacopœias and treatises on *Materia Medica*, and in those, which, like Simon's '*Handbuch der angewandten Medezinischen Chemie*,' are devoted to what may be distinguished as purely medical physiology. The general physiology both of animals and of plants is now also prosecuted mainly as a department of organic chemistry. As regards the former or animal physiology, an able and trustworthy exposition of the present state of our knowledge is contained in the '*Lehrbuch der Physiologischen Chemie*,' of Dr. Lehmann, of which the second volume has just been published. Nor can the microscopical examination of structures, which has hitherto guided both animal and vegetable physiologists so much, any longer proceed without chemical aid. The microscopic investigator, besides an eye trained to observe, must for the future possess also a knowledge of the chemical relations and reactions of bodies, and considerable tact in minute chemical manipulation, if he is to carry forward those more refined physiological inquiries which now form the special field of the general histologist. In what way this combination of skill and knowledge is to be applied, and to what important consequences it may lead, will be best learned by a perusal of the volume of Professor Mulder, '*On the Chemistry of Animal and Vegetable Physiology*.'

In chemical physiology, that which relates to man in a state

of health and of disease — or physiological and pathological human chemistry — has naturally most interest for us. Already in 1806, in his published work on *Animal Chemistry**, Berzelius had collected together the little that was then known, and had himself thrown considerable light upon the chemistry of life. During the remainder of his career he never lost sight of this department; and the experimental results — his own and those of Tiedeman, Gmelin, and others — which he embodied in every successive edition of his '*Lehrbuch*,' and the yearly critiques on its progress which found a place in his '*Årsberättelse*,' caused him to be long regarded as the highest living authority upon the subject.

Among the chief later discoveries in animal chemistry was that of Protein, and its compounds, by Professor Mulder of Utrecht, first published in 1838. Notwithstanding the angry and personal discussions to which this substance has given rise among eminent chemists, and the obscurity which some still believe to hang over its composition, it must be conceded that the discovery itself forms an era in the history of animal chemistry. It has enlightened us, upon the composition of animal fluids and tissues, and upon the qualities and uses of different kinds of food; and has given rise to some most beautiful and interesting speculations on the natural relations between animal and vegetable life. The young chemist who has not read the eloquent lecture of M. Dumas on the '*Chemical Statics of Organised Beings*,'† has yet to be introduced to one of the most delightful little books in the whole range of chemical literature.

But our chronological account of chemistry in its applications to physiology now brings us to another era — that of Liebig, to which we must briefly advert. To its history, both animal and vegetable, this celebrated chemist has not only contributed a large stock of direct and peculiar knowledge, but he has impressed nearly the whole subject, for the present, with the ardent and speculative character of his own mind. It forms, indeed, a fine study to the chemist, to place side by side the mental characteristics of the older Berzelius and the younger Liebig, as inductive philosophers. The slow, calm caution of Berzelius, who trusted little to theory, and never confidently adopted any views, in support of which sound reasons or carefully obtained experimental results could not be

* *Föreläsningar i Djurkemien*. Stockholm: 2 vols. 8vo., 1806–08.

† *Essai de Statique Chimique des Êtres organisés*. Par MM. Dumas et Boussingault. Troisième Edition, 8vo. Paris: 1844.

adduced, was admirably fitted for basing the incipient science upon a sure foundation. But caution does not attract; and, hence, one reason why the great Swede never obtained in England even the temporary favour and regard which the impatient and confident style of Liebig so suddenly acquired. Tired of the colder manner, and more assured steps of his predecessors, our eager temperament disposed us to a ready reception of the bold and dashing hypotheses with which Liebig introduced his more popular systematic books.

We shall never ourselves forget the interest, most like that awakened by our first perusal of *Ivanhoe*, with which we read the earlier memoirs on the cyanic acids, which he published in conjunction with Wöhler. And we have already mentioned the high esteem in which he was held by Berzelius, at a time when he was esteemed simply as the author of analytical memoirs, many of which were certainly very beautiful. On the other hand, a due regard and respect for Berzelius upon the part of Liebig appears to have been shown until after the year 1840. In that year Liebig published his '*Organic Chemistry applied to Agriculture and Physiology*,' and two years later, his similar work on the '*Relations of Organic Chemistry to Physiology and Pathology*.'

In his biographical sketch of Berzelius, '*Minnesfest över J. J. Berzelius*,' Professor Siljerström of Stockholm informs us that previous to the appearance of one or other of these works, Liebig proposed by letter to dedicate it to Berzelius, and inclosed a dedicatory note for his approval. Berzelius, in his reply, added to his thanks for the intended compliment, the remark 'that nothing mortal deserved so great praise;' that if the note was to accompany the dedication, he must decline the honour; and the more positively as in his '*Yearly Report*' personal considerations could not prevent him from freely commenting upon the scientific views which might be advanced in the intended work. The book subsequently appeared with the dedication*, but without the dedicatory note. The critique which followed in the '*Årsberättelse of Berzelius*,' and his condemnation of what he designated as *Probabilitet's Physiologie*, and the subsequent more searching examination of the work by Professor Kohlrausch, of Göttingen†, are still fresh in the recollection of

* This must refer to the German Edition, as the English Editions of both books are dedicated to the British Association.

† *Physiologie und Chemie in ihrer gegenseitigen Stellung, beleuchtet durch eine Kritik von Liebig's Thierchemie.* Göttingen; 1844.

chemists; as also is the angry reply of Liebig to the remarks of Berzelius, inserted first in his journal, and published afterwards in a separate form. In the so-called 'Probabilitet's Physiologie' of Liebig, there is much beautiful poetry. Berzelius was alarmed in proportion to the genius displayed in these speculations. The influence for evil in Liebig's seductive example had made so strong an impression upon his cautious mind, — a mind advancing only from the known to the unknown, — that he expressed to us, towards the close of 1842, his firm belief that the writings of Liebig had done more harm to the safe progress of physiology than could be undone for forty years to come.

We will not discuss this subject, though our sympathies and convictions incline us to the views of Berzelius. Few men have succeeded in obtaining warmer friends and supporters from among his pupils, or of making more numerous and bitter enemies among his equals and contemporaries, than Liebig. A most undesirable facility for publishing, without supervision, what has been hastily written, is afforded by the editing of a journal. To this cause, rather than to any uncontrollable spirit or difficulty of temper, we ascribe the coarse epithets applied to Fritsche and Gerhard, the disparaging terms in which Mitscherlich and Berzelius are spoken of, and the strong expressions poured out in successive contests with Mulder and Dumas. Nor do we ascribe to any thing worse than haste or thoughtless oversight the neglect with which, especially in the 'Chemistry applied to Agriculture,' so many of his predecessors in the same walk are passed over unnamed and unacknowledged, if not unkindly spoken of, at the very moment that he was making use of their experiments and results. Even the outrage to the dignity of pure science implied in the securing of patents for medicines and manures, we regard with leniency in the father of a growing family. Yet it cannot be denied that such circumstances as these have both disgusted and alienated many of his admirers.

We have observed as the characteristic of Berzelius, that he never went further in his theories than known facts would warrant. Accordingly the philosophical world came at last to receive his opinions as eminently safe. Again, it was a recognised merit in the great memoirs of Gay Lussac, that he began by giving an introductory *résumé* of all that was known or had been done previously by others upon the subject of which he was about to treat. The least that can be said of the school of Liebig is, that it has not discouraged hasty and confident over-speculation, or that neglect of past chemical history and literature, which

either passes over, or ignorantly appropriates, the thoughts and discoveries of its predecessors.

One feature in the course pursued at Giessen,—more resembling the tactics of a fierce party in politics than of a school for the investigation of scientific truth,—is not undeserving of reprehensible mention in a philosophical sketch like the present. Formerly, no young man beginning to handle his chemical tools, would have presumed to set up his own authority in contradiction to those of the elder chemists of the time. Suspecting himself rather, his trials would have been repeated and re-repeated, till it was made certain on which side the error lay. At Giessen this custom was abandoned. The tyro of a few months was pitted directly against the most trusted analysts, and set to repeat or refute their experiments. Than this, considered as a school exercise, nothing could be better. But to the results of these juvenile experiments, almost necessarily different, precipitate currency was given in the '*Annalen der Pharmacie*' as corrections of the errors of their distinguished predecessors. And while not unfrequently such pretended corrections have been proved to be themselves erroneous, they have been productive of a double evil. On the one hand, they have unduly ministered to the precocious vanity of students, probably never heard of afterwards, and have taught them the wretched lesson of raising a reputation by undervaluing that of others: on the other hand, they have unhandsomely detracted from the character of older chemists, and besides all personal grievances, have caused a serious injury to science by wasting, over the verification of researches which had been causelessly called in question, much valuable time, which might otherwise have been usefully employed.

The attainment of truth ought to be the supreme aim and motive of the philosophical chemist. But how often, alas! do personal rivalry, — a haste to be distinguished, — the love of novelties, of novel views and novel names, because they are our own, — the dislike of another's views, because they are another's, — a want of the ability, intellectual or moral, to weigh and justly appreciate evidence, — the culpable desire even of causing pain to an opponent, — all the frailties, in short, to which man is exposed, interfere with this aim and motive, and retard the establishment of what is true!

But before we pass from the subject of chemical physiology, the general reader may be pleased to learn, by an intelligible example, in what way the results of experiments performed among the beakers and jars of the chemist, are applied in practice to raise the condition and abate the sufferings of man.

Any substance that has to make its way from the human stomach, through the vessels which proceed to the various parts of the body, must be capable of being dissolved by the fluids of the body. An insoluble substance will pass unchanged and unabsorbed along the alimentary canal, and escape from the body in the usual manner, without producing any materially sensible effect. A soluble substance, on the contrary, passes into the blood, and if nutritious nourishes, if poisonous more or less injuriously affects the functions of life. Thus chemists are now familiar with methods by which in their laboratories many soluble poisonous substances can be united with other bodies, so as to become insoluble, and in this new state be rendered capable of being introduced into the stomach without injurious consequences. To perform such an experiment in the stomach, is to administer an antidote of more or less certain efficacy, against a poison which has been previously swallowed. In this way, lime and magnesia are antidotes against oxalic acid, the white of egg against corrosive sublimate, hydrated per-oxide of iron against white arsenic, and so on. These severally combine with the poisonous substance when brought in contact with it in the stomach, render it insoluble, and consequently inert. Here is a very intelligible application of chemical knowledge; but we have explained it on our way to a much more beautiful one.

Among familiar examples of slow poisoning is the disease known by the name of painters' colic. It is produced in lead mines and lead works by inhaling lead dust, and elsewhere not unfrequently by drinking water impregnated with lead. The metal being introduced into the system in a soluble form, makes its way everywhere among the tissues, and lays the foundation of chronic and frequently returning pains. But diluted sulphuric acid or sulphuretted waters, like those of Harrowgate, render lead insoluble in water, whether in the body or out of it, and are therefore prescribed as common remedies for the painters' colic. Observation, meanwhile, has shown that these remedies, though they assuage or remove the symptoms of the disease, still leave the lead which caused it diffused in an inert state through the body,—ready, when favourable conditions arise, again to act injuriously on the bodily health. It is only the other day that M. Melsens, of Brussels, perfected this subdivision of chemical physiology, and gave us the means both of detecting the lurking presence of the metal in the system, and of entirely expelling it as a cause of disease. A substance known in chemistry and pharmacy by the name of iodide of potassium is capable of decomposing the insoluble compounds of lead, and of bringing the metal into a new condition in which it readily dissolves in

water. If a person be poisoned with lead, his system struggles to throw it off, the metal makes its way through his kidneys, and can be detected in his urine. Cure him by sulphuric acid or sulphuretted water, and with the pain the lead disappears from his urine, but remains in the system. Give him now a dose of iodide of potassium, and the pains of poisoning return, and lead reappears in the water. A large dose will prostrate him with colic, but small doses, at frequent intervals, will gradually wash away the metal without any sensible suffering. The cure is complete as soon as a large dose of the medicine brings neither a return of the anguish, nor of the lead into the fluid excretions. So, mercury after protracted salivation, lingers likewise long in the system, but the same chemical compound washes it effectually out; and over certain other hitherto unmanageable metals it exercises a similar power. The medical practitioner learns to form in the interior of the patient, and for his cure and comfort, the same preparations which the chemist, for the purposes of science, has already often formed and studied in his laboratory.

But the manner in which chemistry has been of late indispensably connected with far more refined physiological inquiries, bearing ultimately on questions of human health, may also be made intelligible.

• A knowledge of functional physiology is now necessary to practical medicine. A full-bodied man is prostrated with apoplexy, heavily breathing, speechless, and scarcely a subject for hope. Where inordinate eating has been an immediate cause, to empty the bowels is to give a chance of returning sense and life. But the internal stomach is inaccessible, and the medical attendants look grave, until one bolder than the rest removes by known means a portion of the skin from the outer surface of the digestive region, and applies croton oil to the raw spot upon the senseless body. The powerful medicine is sensibly absorbed, the bowels are moved, and the patient is saved. A mere knowledge of the functions of tissues, and the nature of remedies, suggests curative applications of this description. But among the most hopeless, if not the most distressing and painful diseases to which humanity is liable, is diabetes. It is characterised by the presence of sugar in the urine, a substance not usually produced in healthy persons. Many tests by which its presence and quantity can be ascertained, have been supplied by chemistry; and the daily quantity indicates the progress or retrocession of the disease. But to check this abnormal production by administering food not easily converted into it by known processes, was nearly all the advice which chemistry

could in this case give to medicine, and it constituted nearly all in the way of special remedy which the physician was able to employ. The cause and seat of the disease were alike unknown. A sudden glimmer, however, appears to have been thrown upon the subject through an observation by M. Bernard,—that if a slight wound be inflicted upon the fourth ventricle of the brain, a little above the origin of the eighth pair of nerves, the pneumo-gastric, which proceed among other organs to those of digestion, the urine becomes charged with sugar, and presents the other characters usual in diabetic disease. The study of chemical symptoms, therefore, must be combined with that of the chemical functions of the different parts of the body, and of the derangements of those functions which almost insensible lesions may occasion. How curious, that in a malady where both departments of science are called in, chemistry should almost exclusively fix the attention upon the urine, while physiology bids us turn our efforts chiefly to the condition of the brain! It will readily occur to some of our readers that M. Bernard's observation, if fully established, communicates directly with many other most interesting questions still open to discussion, such as those which relate to the true theoretical action and real practical effect of substances employed as food for man and other animals.

Intimately connected with inquiries such as those we have been noticing, is Sanatory Chemistry,—a subject very popular in its nature, wide in its extent, important to all classes of society in every country, and yet unfortunately but little understood, and until recently as little appreciated. The composition of the atmosphere,—the nature, needs, and effects of healthy respiration,—the properties and influence of injurious gases and exhalations,—the constitution and wholesome chemical and other influences of the sun's rays,—the priceless value of pure and abundant water,—the impurities of wells in towns,—the blessings which attend upon cleanliness of person, and in our streets and dwellings,—these are some of the comprehensive questions which this division of scientific inquiry includes, and into which chemical investigation is daily making way.

Then Forensic chemistry brings us into close contact with questions of law and the controversies of the courts. What is called Medical Jurisprudence includes only a part of forensic chemistry, and yet it boasts the elaborate treatises of Orfila, Christison, Taylor, and Beck, besides many valuable German works, and countless minor books and dissertations. Cases of poisoning form the staple branch of this department. They have recently been of unusual frequency in England, and in some instances of so wholesale a character as forcibly to arrest

the attention of the public, and to call for legal restrictions on the sale of poisonous substances.

The introduction of a bill by Lord Carlisle for this purpose, and its subsequent passage in the present session of Parliament, has recalled to our mind a state of things which existed in Normandy a few years ago, the cause and cure for which may suggest the adoption of other measures of prevention among ourselves also, in addition to the legislative measures already passed into a law. In Normandy, it had long been the practice, as it still is in some of our southerly English counties, to use white arsenic for the steeping of seed corn, with a view to the destruction of insects and fungi — as the midge, smut, rust, &c. — by which grain crops are frequently very much injured. This abundance of arsenic among the people, and their familiarity with its use, brought every season before the courts, from the rural districts, a yearly crop of poison cases, in which arsenic had been employed for the destruction of human life. With a view to provide a remedy, it was at first remitted to the Departmental Society of Agriculture, to inquire whether this use of arsenic was indispensable, and whether in the *chaulage du blé* other substances of a less dangerous character might not replace it both effectually and economically. The experiments made by direction of the Society enabled them to report that arsenic might be dispensed with, and that less deadly substances were as cheap and efficacious. A law was passed in consequence, forbidding the use of arsenic in the preparation (pickling) of seed corn, and the annual group of poisoning trials disappeared. 'If,' as we believe, it is chiefly in those parts of England where arsenic has been so employed for agricultural purposes, that our home poisonings with it have also been most frequent, the abandonment or prohibition of it in the farm might not only remove in some cases the means and direct temptation to crime, but might in others take away also a source of evil suggestions which afterwards lead to the purchase of poison for otherwise unthought-of ends.

‘How oft the sight of means to do ill deeds
Makes ill deeds done!’

Forensic chemistry, besides such questions as properly engage the medical jurist, embraces also a crowd of inquiries, almost endless in variety, connected with the validity and alleged infringement of patents, with the adulteration of substances liable to duty for the purpose of defrauding the revenue, with the creation of nuisances, or with the injuries produced by manufacturing operations. It is also more or less directly interested in all those adulterations of articles of domestic consumption,

by which the health and comfort of the people are liable to be affected, and against which the public are driven to seek protection in courts of law. Upon these topics we cannot dilate. But such of our readers as feel an interest, especially in regard to the instances we have mentioned last, will consult with advantage the excellent manual which Dr. Adolf Duflos has dedicated to this vitally important subject.*

The small remainder of our space is due to the consideration of general chemistry as an aid to industry, both individual and national. And here, taking the more comprehensive works of Schubarth or of Knapp, as our guides, we might illustrate by a thousand special cases the direct money value of chemical knowledge, and even of profound chemical research, to the material prosperity of a country like our own.

In its application to the arts of life, indeed, almost as easily as in any other way, the progress of this science can be palpably made manifest to the most ordinary understanding. If the older work of Aiken on the Chemical Arts be compared with the later Dictionary of Dr. Ure, or the treatise of Dumas, and these again with the still later German publications, it will be seen not only that all the separate arts known to the older author (Aiken) have been greatly improved — old difficulties, delays, and expenses removed by the discovery of new methods — but that numerous new arts are described, which in the interval have sprung into existence and assumed a more or less important place among the sources of national or local wealth. And further, by a comparison of the newest work on Chemical Technology with the one immediately preceding it, the rate of progress at the present moment will be found to be more rapid than at any previous period in chemical history.

Or a person less conversant with books, but who takes some interest in the matter, may arrive at the same result in another way. If, bearing clearly in his mind what he had seen during a pains-taking visit to the workshops of London, Birmingham, Sheffield, Manchester, or Glasgow, some thirty years ago, he should now again revisit these centres of industry and attempt to compare their present with their past processes and products, the change would appear absolutely wonderful. The new, more

* Die wichtigsten Lebens-Bedürfnisse, ihre Acchtheit und Güte. Breslau: 1846. Now that coffee and chicory, and wheaten flour, and so many other articles of daily use are the subjects of countless adulterations, a book like that of Duflos's, but adapted to our circumstances, has become a want in English literature. Since Accum's 'Death in the Pot,' we have had no special book devoted to this subject.

speedy, and simpler modes of arriving at the same results — the numerous subdivisions of labour, elevating what were probably regarded as mere processes of detail, into separate manufactures and branches of business — the multitude of new and totally distinct arts and workshops — the new intellectual resources which even common men seem now to have at easy command — and the new uses to which the waste materials of former years are now applied, — these will astonish him almost as much as our machine shops, in which the fingers of the dexterous workman appear to persuade rather than compel the inert material to do his bidding, until the dead metal seems fashioned to do something little less than think.

To watch from year to year the details of improvements like those which our visitor would recognise, is one of the most interesting occupations of the scientific observer. Difficulties bring out resources. Even apparently insurmountable crises in a manufacture only stimulate the energies of the conquering intellect. An important branch of industry appears about to succumb — to shift its locality at least, and take up a more favoured home in another country, — when chemistry suggests that its work should be done after a new fashion. The suggestion is adopted, and the greater perfection and economy which attend the change, give the old locality a fresh start, and secure to the failing manufacture fresh triumphs over dreaded rivals.

A change in fiscal regulations, the competition of slave labour and other causes, have threatened to root out the growth of sugar from our West India colonies. But a chemical experiment, made in Brussels by Melsens, suggested to him improvements in the treatment of cane juice, which promise to give to capital and skilled labour in this branch of industry the same victory over mere manual toil, which in all other arts they have gradually been acquiring. Again, the progress of the art of spinning had not only enabled the cotton machinery to produce threads of a fineness which Indian beauties never dreamed of, but the costliest linen cambrics of Holland and Flanders were already surpassed by the produce of our native looms. The machinery of the flax mills, however, had exhausted its skill upon the stubborn material, which refused to stretch to a more subtle fibre, or produce a finer yarn. But chemistry examined the substance by which the fibres are naturally held together; and forthwith spinning by the aid of steam heat compelled the glutinous matter to relax its hold and the delicate fibres to slip along each other into threads of previously unattainable tenuity. The steeping of flax too was a tedious process, pregnant with nauseous exhalations and with frequent disease. For ages par-

particular streams were famed for their efficacy in steeping, and particular localities enjoyed centuries of reputation for their unspun flax. The fineness of the fibre depended on the plant being neither full grown nor rank: and it was held impossible to grow to a profit both seed and stem at once. But a new mode of steeping has been devised by Schenk owing to a chemical discovery. This invention has shortened the process to a few hours; has placed all localities on an equal level, by making all tolerably pure waters equally available; has abolished the yearly nuisance and frequent disease; has extracted the finest fibre from the rankest and ripest plant; and has thus placed within the reach of the farmer and of the country the double profit of a full crop of ripe seed, along with a heavy harvest of luxuriant stems. Even upon this improvement further improvements are already spoken of, and a rival patentee is threatening to supersede, by the employment of steam, the hot water employed in the process of Schenk. Further, a cloud was approaching the factories of Lancashire. Cotton, the growth of a rival country, it is feared, might become scarce, and rise in price,—consequences which would seriously embarrass our staple manufacture. Another chemical process here steps in, tears still further in pieces the single hollow fibres of the flax, and produces a material which resembles cotton in appearance, can be spun with the same machinery, and according to the discoverer, M. Claussen, may in all probability be brought into the market at a price low enough to compete successfully with natural cotton. Thus a new material is likely to be supplied to our home manufactures, and at the same time a boundless field opened, and a new stimulus given, to our home agriculture—a new bond, in fact, created between the already inseparable interests of our town and country communities. M. Claussen already speaks of larger orders than can be supplied.

As in this way the science of chemistry has lent itself to the advancement of one art, so it has done with a thousand others.

The paper on which we write—the child of waste flax and cotton fabrics—tells us daily of its obligations to chemical research. The discovery of chlorine gave a method of removing all colour from tissues which had been dyed or printed with vegetable or animal colours. It thus widened the sources of the supply of this raw material to the manufacturer, and kept down the price of paper to the consumer, while the demands of the press and the post office increased.* Then, after numerous adjustments

We have before us a literary curiosity which indicates another direction in which the scarcity of material guided the research of

had perfected this application, it was found difficult, under certain circumstances, to prepare a pulp so free from excess of chlorine as to prevent, in the lapse of time, the bleaching of the ink upon the paper which was made from it. But this difficulty also has been overcome: and the prescribed use of an *anti-chlor*, as the makers call it, employed according to their prescription, removes the entire residue of the bleaching substance, and secures to well-prepared ink an indelible permanence. Still the bleached material is often deficient in whiteness, to disguise which the manufacturer copies the expedient of the laundress; or a decided blue tint, as in the paper before us, is wished for, and the requisite colouring matter must be added to the pulp.

The preparation of the beautiful smalts of our workshops from the crude poisonous ores of cobalt is one of our latest triumphs. This fine blue was employed by the paper makers, but the best qualities were very dear. The precious ultramarine, which the devotee of the highest art could barely afford to purchase, was looked upon with covetous eyes by the cultivators of this and of many other arts of life. But to obtain it, in sufficient quantity, and at a reasonable price, was beyond their hope. Chemists analysed it, and determined its composition; in their hands the ingredients of which it is made up still resisted all persuasion to re-unite into the coveted blue. Men's eyes being instructed, however, a blue substance was observed occasionally to present itself in the refuse of certain processes of chemical manufacture. This refuse was collected, examined, analysed, and found in quality and composition to be identical with the natural ultramarine. An after study of the conditions under which it was produced in the furnace, suggested the successive processes of a new manufacture; and the paper maker, along with a thousand others, now rejoices in supplies of Nuremberg blue, or artificial ultramarine, which can be made in any country, from materials common and abundant,

paper makers about the beginning of the present century. It is entitled 'Historical Account of the Substances which have been used to describe Events and to convey Ideas from the earliest Date to the Invention of Paper: printed on the first useful Paper manufactured solely from Straw. London, 1800.' It is a thin 8vo., of which part is printed on paper made from straw, and the remainder on paper made from wood. Among the many uses to which it has been proposed from time to time to turn the Irish bogs, one is to convert them into paper! We possess a sample of beautiful pure white pulp, fit for the paper-mill, prepared from peat by chemical treatment; and we believe both straw and peat are now used, to some extent, in the manufacture of inferior kinds of wrapping and hangings paper.

and with shades of colour which vie with the brightest and most beautiful that live on the immortal canvass.

Nor do results of a higher order fail at times to show themselves. We close by one brief example.

Among the substances which are contained in and are necessary to the composition and usefulness of the bread of man, is one to which chemists give the name of phosphate of lime. This material the growing corn extracts from the soil. Without its presence in sufficient abundance in the earth through which its roots spread, the plant flourishes poorly, the ear is ill-filled, and the produce of grain scanty. The bones of animals contain this phosphate of lime, and it has for half a century been customary to apply them in a crushed or broken form to the soil to fit it for the healthy growth of luxuriant crops of corn. But chemistry established the fact that certain stones and rocky masses which occur in various parts of the earth, contain the same phosphate of lime. It has recently, therefore, advised the grower of grain to take advantage of these mineral masses. And now, after previous preparation, by a simple chemical process, they are extensively employed to impart fertility to the soil. In the account of the temptation of our Saviour the tempter said, 'If thou be the Son of God; command that these stones be made bread.' In our indirect conversion of stones into bread, the prosecution of science has conferred upon man a power analogous to that which to common apprehension partakes of the divine. It is the Deity rewarding with a portion of his own power, the right exercise of that sublime intellect which is a portion of his own spirit.

Our illustrations of the wide dominion and vast applications of this growing science must here cease. We have not dwelt so long upon its history and recent progress with the view of merely placing before our readers an intelligible picture of its actual importance at the present moment. Our hope is, that from the glimpse we have given of its past and present, an idea may be formed also of the great future which awaits it, and a right estimate made of the position it ought to occupy in national estimation, the proportion of study which ought to be generally devoted to it as a part of liberal education, and the share of sympathy and support which are due to those who cultivate it by profession.

A science which asserts a rational sway over every kingdom of nature — which is indispensable as an auxiliary to so many other branches of physical knowledge — which explains so many most striking natural appearances, and which, is related in such

countless ways to the arts and conveniences of life, is surely entitled to as high a place as any other among all the sciences which, in the progress of civilisation, are contending for precedence and homage. It has this advantage, too, above almost all other sciences, that the condition of man here below depends in great measure for advancement upon its future progress, while no other pursuit has enlarged its sphere so wonderfully, nor been rewarded with such astonishing success. The promises of alchemy were nothing to what has already been accomplished.

'We have no curiosity about that of which we know nothing,' was said by Sismondi. It is the almost total ignorance of chemistry on the part of our older university men, which has hitherto excluded this branch of knowledge from the list of subjects of instruction in nearly all the educational institutions over which their influence extends. We can neither appreciate the claims nor the value of a science of which we have been taught nothing. We cannot even by private study learn to appreciate them justly when the science is one which is incapable, from its very nature, of being taught by books alone.

The modern practice in our English colleges and universities of selecting the heads and teachers almost exclusively from their own house-taught members or alumni, tends to perpetuate the exclusion of modern and growing branches of knowledge, and to stereotype old forms and confined limits in collegiate and scholastic teaching. Even the now long-favoured Greek had once difficulties to overcome similar to those which at present beset the sciences of observation. The pressure for innovation and improvement must, therefore, be made from without by those who feel the urgency of each particular instance: and in this way strength will be given to the hands of the few men within, who are aware of the real advances and value of positive knowledge *, and of the demand for it which exists throughout the great body of the nation.

We have been struck by some facts and reasonings in connexion with this subject in a pamphlet † recently published by Principal Wayland, of Brown University, Providence, New Jersey. From this pamphlet it appears that, though the population of New England has been greatly increasing during the last twenty

* Oxford, we are glad to see, has broken the ice, and has recently raised the stipends of the Professor of Chemistry, and of the Reader of Experimental Philosophy, and of the Camden Professor of History, to 300*l.* a year each; with 250*l.* a year each to the Readers in Mineralogy and Geology, and to the Professor of Moral Philosophy.

† Report to the Corporation of Brown University, on the Changes in the System of Collegiate Education. Providence: 1850.

or thirty years, the number of students at its various colleges and universities, even those of most repute, has been gradually decreasing. At first this was ascribed to the great expense of the existing system of college education, and efforts were made to lessen it by lowering the fees and the cost of board. But the reduction in numbers still went on, and it has not been arrested even in those colleges in which education has been given gratuitously. It was not owing, therefore, to any undue expense in the system. Nor did it arise, as Dr. Wayland shows, from want of talent in the professors, from defective modes of teaching, or from inefficient examinations for university honours. He concludes, therefore, in mercantile phraseology, that 'the article which the universities offer for sale is not such as the public want, and therefore they don't come to buy it.' He proposes, in consequence, to the trustees of his own college, to remodel the whole system of instruction, to create new courses of study, comprehending those branches of knowledge which are actually in public demand, so arranged as to afford time to learn each branch as thoroughly as circumstances may require, and to attach to eminence in each honorary distinctions similar to those hitherto awarded in the form of degrees in arts. Thus, instead of one fixed and invariable routine, he would offer students the choice of several sets of equivalent studies, a due acquaintance with which on examination should entitle the candidates in them to equal honours. If a fair measure of success should follow this movement in Brown University, it must exercise a powerful influence upon the other colleges in the United States, and ultimately upon those of our own country.

But whatever fate may await the wide reform of Dr. Wayland, it is plain, we think, that in a century during which the progress of civilisation has taken so distinctly positive and material a direction, the science of Chemistry, which presides over material progress in so many of its most interesting and important directions, cannot remain shut out from its legitimate place and influence in the educational institutions of the empire.

